DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 167 IR 010 400

TITLE	Cable Television and the Performing Arts. The Proceedings of a Conference (New York, New York, June 5-7, 1981).
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., NY. School of the Arts.
SPONS AGENCY	John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jun 81
NOTE	88p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Audiences; Broadcast Industry; *Cable Television; Copyrights; Cultural Activities; *Discussion; Music Activities; Opera; *Programing (Broadcast); Technological Advancement; Telecommunications; *Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Market Forecasts; *Market Research; Negotiation Processes; *Pay Television

ABSTRACT

Included in this set of proceedings are a keynote address on the state of the art of cable television and the future of the television economy by Les Brown, editor-in-chief of "Channels" magazine; panel discussions on the structure of the cable television industry; the potential market for cable television arts programming; the birth and development of cable television channels oriented solely toward arts programming; the perspective of television producers regarding the development of arts programming for cable television; the current state of the art of cable television programming and production of the performing arts; and four aspects of cable television production, including production and broadcast rights and the financial support of arts activities broadcast over cable television. Also included are appendices listing the conference agenda, brief biographies of the panelists who participated in the conference, conference participants, and selected readings on topics covered by the conference. Question and answer sessions accompany each of the panel discussions. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222167

The Proceedings of a Conference on

Cable Television and the Performing Arts

Sponsored by

New York University School of the Arts

June 5-7, 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

© 1981 New York University

This publication was made possible by a grant from
The John and Mary R. Markle Foundation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Michael Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR010400

Contents

Introduction	i
Keynote Address	1
Industry Structure and Analysis	5
Market Analysis	13
The New Channels	22
The Producer's View	33
State of the Art	40
From Rights to Residuals	52
Appendix I : Conference Agenda	62
Appendix II : Panelists' Biographies	65
Appendix III : Conferees	77
Appendix IV : Annotated Bibliography	83

Introduction

In June, 1981, the School of the Arts held a three day conference on Cable Television and the Performing Arts. Over one hundred and thirty theatre, dance, music and opera people from around the country gathered at the university's Washington Square campus to hear key people from the cable industry tell all. There was a certain feeling of excitement at the opening luncheon. The curtain was about to go up on a new era in the communications industry, and "we" were about to find out "what was in it for us." This publication of the PROCEEDINGS is a chronicle of the three days which followed.

The School of the Arts has a responsibility to serve the professions it represents, and regularly sponsors conferences or special seminars which address questions of common concern. The specific focus and agenda of this conference happened to develop from a particular experience of my own. In the summer of 1980, I had wanted to option a play for a Broadway production. It was to be a co-producing arrangement with a resident theater, where the play had been originally staged. This was a serious play which had been very well received. It deserved to be seen by a major audience, but its chances of returning the investment required for a commercial run were slim. Where I was primarily concerned about protecting my investors, my co-producers were equally concerned about seeing a substantial return on their own already considerable investment in the property. We were both seeking a way to make ends meet. I went in search of ancillary income, and found cable television.

That was just over a year ago. What I found then does not bear repeating now. Let's just say that there was a lot of activity, a lot of "opportunity," and not much "ancillary income." Within a few months, however, the picture changed. HBO added a theatre division. ABC announced ARTS. CBS announced CBS CABLE, a cultural channel. PBS was drafting plans for the Grand Alliance. AND newly elected President Reagan was cutting the budget. The new era of cable was arriving just in time to save us all. Was it?

After another month or so of rumor innundation -- "Did you hear that so and so made a deal with RCTV?" "CBS has a six million dollar foreign acquisition budget, and Joe Papp is going to produce all their theatre programming." "So and so withdrew her play from such and such a theatre because they insisted on the cable rights." "So and so just offered X Performing Arts Center $$$$ for right of first refusal on all their productions." -- I thought "a clear the air" conference might be a real service to everyone.

As conferences go, this one proved to be interesting, at times provocative and, in the end, useful. All of the participants shared like concerns and, for the most part, like expectations. All of the industry representatives were forthcoming, and within understandable boundaries, they were candid. The fact that some bubbles burst and most of us left expecting far less from cable than when

we came, did not dampen our spirits. Numerous first name relationships developed, useful professional contacts were made, and the conference ended on a note of warm conviviality. A necessary dialogue had begun. These PROCEEDINGS are put together in the hope of sharing that beginning dialogue as accurately as possible.

There are several people who should be remembered in any recounting of this conference. Arthur Whitelaw of Home Box Office and Lou Moore of ELM Video Theatre were most helpful in developing the agenda and in suggesting panelists. Red Burns of the Alternate Media Center led us to many of the key panelists and panel chairs. Betsy Lee was the meticulous and indefatigable Conference Manager, who made the weekend seem like a pleasure cruise. And Mary Milton of The John and Mary R. Markle Foundation had the good sense and sagacity to provide the necessary financial assistance for recording and editing the Proceedings of a Conference on Cable Television and the Performing Arts.

J. Michael Miller
Associate Dean
New York University School of the Arts

Keynote Address

by Les Brown,
Editor-in-Chief, *Channels*

The following story about Oliver Wendell Holmes serves as a fitting metaphor for what is happening in television today: Oliver Wendell Holmes, having left the Court for the day, was settled on the train and going through briefs when the conductor appeared collecting tickets. Holmes searched pockets and briefcase for his ticket, but could not find it. The conductor sought to reassure him by saying he should not worry; they were certain he would pay for his ticket. "I thank you my good man," Holmes replied, "but the issue is not whether I will pay for my ticket. The issue is where I am going."

The issue with new technologies -- cable, two-way cable, DBS, Teletext, low power television, MDS, STV, video discs and video recorders -- is not who is going to pay. The issue is where is all this taking us.

Everyone says we are experiencing a technological revolution. We are experiencing a technological explosion, but the revolution is a social one. What is truly revolutionary is that people are willing to pay for what they see on television. Before now, people accepted what was programmed for them on television. The excitement today is that people will pay for what they want to see.

Pay television was made practical by the intersection of two technologies: cable and satellite. In 1975 HBO (Home Box Office) began distributing its pay television programming via satellite. This made wide distribution of cable programming more practical than ever before.

Many large companies have entered the cable business, because it is going to be a big business, bigger perhaps than the telephone. Eventually, people will be paying more for television services than for their transportation. It will also do more than deliver programs. A cable system can provide burglar and fire alarm service, bank-at-home services, and shop-at-home services.

It has been demonstrated that people will pay for movies, and that cable-delivered movies reach a new segment of the audience, one that does not, for the most part, go out to movie theaters. The movie theater audience is primarily the 18-34 group. Pay television reaches older people and children, so a whole new audience has been tapped by cable. Similarly, there are people who do not attend live theatre and opera. It's expensive, performances sell out, or it is not available. Opera and theatre can now be delivered to the home in color and stereo. Cable extends the box office to several million seats.

State of the Art: The Qube system, developed by Warner Amex in Columbus, Ohio, is now considered to be the state of the art. With it a subscriber can buy one event at a time (called pay-per-view). There are 10 channels on the Columbus Qube, and a person can buy one viewing of one event for from $1.50 to $3.50. With this capacity, the Qube system serves an additional box office function: it gives a count of viewers, event by event.

Pay-per-view is possible on the Qube system through what is called an addressable converter attached to each television set in the system. The converter transmits a signal to the cable operator's record-keeping location whenever someone views a particular program. This is also referred to as two-way cable.

The Qube experiment has been dubbed a tremendous success by the press, but there is no evidence that as a business it is successful. Be that as it may, two-way cable is the state of the art now, and Warner Amex is acquiring franchises all around the country because it offers this two-way form of cable. Because two-way cable is the state of the art, that is what we will have, even though we do not know whether it is good business.

If two-way is state of the art, so is 52 channel capacity. Some equipment allows over 100 channels. Many people are asking how these channels will be filled. I think these channels will be filled up in a hurry, because lots of people want to enter this market and there are many ways of offering service beyond traditional programs.

When considering how to fill between 52 and 110 channels, the operative word is not "programs" but "programming." It is a situation like New York City radio which has 70 stations. Cable is more like radio than like traditional television. Radio is programmed vertically. If I want to listen to classical music, I'll turn on a station that has classical music all day long. Vertical programming establishes a certain expectation about the nature of the station's programs. Cable will have to do that too, because it is the only way the channels will be distinguishable from each other.

Imagine that there is a program on channel 42 at 4:00 in the afternoon. How is anyone going to find out about it? Not from TV Guide. TV Guide would have to publish a book the size of the telephone directory for nearly every zip code to give complete program information. Teletext will be the only way to find out what's on channel 42 at 4:00 PM on a certain day. You will ask your television what is on at a given time. Or, perhaps more likely, you will ask your television, for example, what sitcoms are on tonight? Teletext will break out this information by category: sitcoms, documentaries, etc.

Changes in the Television Economy: All of the diversity cable makes possible will change the economy of telecasting. Programs on commercial television with an audience of 20 million are considered failures. Twenty million people would fill a Broadway theater to capacity for 8 performances a week for 50 years.

My new magazine, Channels, needs a circulation of 50,000 to succeed. Yet many magazines with over a million circulation are floundering and failing today. The difference in each case is one of scale.

If there is a pay channel with 5 million subscribers who pay $10 per month, there is a box office of $50 million per month. Out of that income, the transponder must be paid for, the cable operator must be paid. If $25 million is set aside for those expenses, that still leaves $25 million for programming. You can do a helluva lot of important stuff for $25 million a month, so the potential is present.

However, I do not want to just give you blue sky. Michael Miller asked me to tell you what it is really like out there, so I am offering the following sobering thoughts:

·Most of the major cities from which you are likely to draw most of your potential audience will not be wired for 3 or 4 years.

·More than 60 percent of cable systems that now exist are first generation CATV operations with a capacity of 12 channels, and those channels are pretty well filled and declared. Some of the newer systems have 20 channels. So the universe we are considering now is limited in capacity, and the people you want to reach do not yet have cable.

·The satellite from which most systems receive -- RCA's Satcom I (which carries HBO, the biggest seller) is filled to capacity. There are other satellites, and HBO may move to another satellite, but for a cable system to receive from two different satellites, there must be a different earth station for each satellite or the super earth station that Satcom has developed and nobody can afford. So, if you are a programmer, and you are not carried on a major satellite, this limits your potential audience. This is similar to having a magazine which is available on some stands but not on all.

·The people who are running the cable business today are "in it for the big bucks." They talk of narrowcasting to the public, but in private they say, "You know narrowcasting is a myth," and they mean it. They want to put the least expensive, most commercial programs on cable. Whatever will involve the least investment is what they want to program.

·The people running the cable networks today are the people who used to run commercial television networks. These people will bring their values to cable and these are the values of commercial television.

·Radio, records, and movies were all thought to be a boon to the arts when they first developed. If they were a boon at all, it was a very small boon.

·ABC, CBS, RCA and the other commercial networks were forced to move into the cable business by Wall Street. Wall Street requires that they demonstrate that they are not behind the times, that they are not dinosaurs. Otherwise, their stocks may suffer.

·The commercial network affiliates, on the other hand, do not take kindly to seeing their parents found ventures that will be in direct competition with them. The affiliates, however, are not threatened by the introduction of arts programming. They know they will not lose audiences to it. This suggests that there is a certain kind of cynicism behind the networks' entry into cable via arts programming.

·There are dire possible consequences should all three networks fail with their arts programming. That would give "proof" that the high road leads to poverty, and that could be a terrific setback for the arts. The networks can say, "God knows we tried."

·To go at it from another direction: the Seattle Supersonics are leasing a channel and are selling season tickets to their games on television at $120 a year. For $10.00 a month you can see all the Supersonics' home games. This is an interesting experiment in do-it-yourself cable programming that might be possible in a variety of situations from the Kennedy Center to the Guthrie Theater.

Finally, I advise you not to rely on the kindness of strangers. To the extent that it is possible, I think you ought to explore doing it yourselves.

Thank you.

Industry Structure and Analysis

Chair:
Lawrence B. Hilford
Management Consultant Supervising Rainbow Programming Services

Panelists:
John Gault
President, Manhattan Cable TV
Vivian Horner
Vice President, Program Development, Warner Amex Cable Communications, Inc.

Statement by Lawrence B. Hilford

The first panel will cover what has happened in the cable industry to the present, why, and what will be happening in the next few years. Discard whatever you may have heard or read about the industry thus far, and underscore the uncertainty of the present and the near future. No one can predict the future of cable and the performing arts. Much of what is read in the press must be discarded because it is too simple and over-general.

Basic History of Cable: Cable TV began during the 50's as a solution for localities that could not receive clear television signals. Television signals, being line of sight, do not travel over mountains or tall buildings, so localities on the wrong sides of mountains or buildings were unable to receive clear reception (or, in some cases, any reception at all). Sales of television sets in these areas were restricted. Cable technology was created to get the signals over the mountains to expand the market for television sets.

Once the wrong sides of mountains had been wired, cable operators turned to locales with limited service, for example, smaller cities that were served by only one or two of the three networks. To add variety to the available offerings in such locations, the cable operators imported distant signals. This, in turn, offered more choice to the viewer who was willing to pay for the service. More of the country was wired as a result.

By the early 70's, most rural and small, limited service markets had been exploited to their limits. During the early 70's, the cable industry discovered that in areas where reception was good (hence cable was not needed to improve it and variety was available) people were still willing to pay for certain kinds of programming that were commercial-free and not ordinarily available on commercial television. This marked the birth of pay television.

Now it is clear that there is an audience that will pay for more than one service, and a number of pay services have been developed (for example, Bravo, Home Box Office, and Showtime). The industry does not know yet how much people are prepared to pay, so we do not know the limits of this

kind of programming. The cable picture today includes a number of pay alternatives along with basic services, some of which are advertiser-supported.[1]

The next step in the development of the cable market will be the introduction of new services: home shopping, home security, bank-at-home, and teletext.

Current Statistics:

- There are approximately 80 million homes in the U.S. today with television.
- Approximately 40 million of these are passed by cable. (That is to say they are close enough to cable wiring to be a part of a cable system.)
- Approximately 20 million are subscribers to cable television.
- Approximately 10 million have pay services in their homes.

Five Years From Now:

- Approximately 85 million homes in the U.S. will have television sets.
- Approximately 55 million homes will be passed by cable.
- Approximately 30 million will subscribe to cable.
- There will be approximately 30 million pay subscribers.

"Subscribers" here are counted by service to which they subscribe, not by individuals or by individual homes. Therefore, one person may represent 3 subscription services.

Other Methods of Delivery: There are other methods of delivering pay television programming in addition to cable. STV or subscription television reaches about 1 million homes currently, not through wire but in over-the-air broadcast of a scrambled signal which is decoded by a box in the subscriber's home. Best estimates expect this alternative to continue to attract subscribers and then to begin to shrink.

MDS or multi-point distribution service is a microwave system transmitting signals over-the-air in all directions. It is hampered, however, because its signals are stopped by tall buildings and mountains. MDS currently has approximately 500,000 to 600,000 subscribers but is expected to fade fast as a competitor.

DBS, direct broadcast-satellite-to-home service's primary function will be to provide pay services to rural areas where cable wiring is uneconomical. Not expected to be operational until 1985-90, this will be a major broadcast

---

[1]There are two kinds of services available to the cable subscriber: basic, which is provided for the regular monthly fee and pay, or premium, which is provided for an extra fee. (Editor's note)

service expected to reach the 10 to 20 million homes that cable will not reach.

The Future: Because of the huge sums involved in constructing cable systems, the future will see more and more consolidation of ownership of cable companies into what is known as MSO's multiple-system operators)[1] and increasing vertical integration, i.e., consolidation of cable contractors and operators and program suppliers.[2]

Statement by John Gault

I have just returned from the National Cable Television Association (NCTA) Convention in Los Angeles. In 1961, there were 2,000 people at the NCTA convention, and this year, only 20 years later, there were 15,000 people selling program services mostly to major cable systems. This will give you an idea of how rapid the growth of the industry has been.

What is it like to be a cable company today? Technology is moving companies in the direction of becoming cable supermarkets offering many services with few of the regulations that govern standard commercial television broadcasting comapnies.

Manhattan Cable has a relatively sophisticated system. We have a channel capacity of 35, of which we are currently using 27. Once new converters are provided for our subscribers, we will begin using all 35 channels, and additional services will be possible.[3] Presently, Manhattan Cable uses optical fiber to carry signals between Madison Square Garden and the Gulf and Western Building. The rest of the system utilizes coaxial cable to carry signals.[4]

---

[1] An MSO is a company that owns and operates several cable systems in various locations, often in different states. (Editor's note)

[2] For example, Time, Inc. owns ATC (American Television and Communications Corporation), the nation's largest multiple system operator, and HBO (Home Box Office), the nation's first and largest satellite-distributed pay television service. This makes economic sense, and the leverage possibilities are enormous. (Editor's note)

[3] A converter, usually a small box that sits on top of the television set, takes the place of the television channel selector which can provide only 12 channels. The converter makes a larger number of channels available and decodes scrambled signals of pay channels. (Editor's note)

[4] Optical fiber can carry more signals than the standard coaxial cable of cable systems. It is also nearly immune to electromagnetic interference. Some feel that eventually the cable industry will have to convert from coaxial cable to optical fiber for transmission of signals. (Editor's note)

A separate coaxial cable link carries institutional data -- perhaps more than is carried by any other service today. The data systems of American Express and Manufacturer's Hanover Trust which are carried on our institutional system intersect, for example. This coaxial cable network for the transmission of institutional data is more reliable (the error rate is lower) than that of the telephone company. I see the institutional network as the next step in the development of the supermarket of cable company services.

Cable television must carry certain off-the-air signals, including those which would normally be delivered via the channel selector (the usual broadcast stations in any area). Often franchise agreements also require that channels be set aside for local access or public use. Manhattan Cable has more of these "must carry's" than any other system in operation in the country. As a result our channel capacity (the number of channels open for programming) is strained, and we are limited in what additional services we can make available to our subscribers. People who are packaging arts programming come to me, but my capacity to add services is such that there is little I can do for them. Our system is too strained to carry what is available now.

Manhattan Cable serves 130,000 individual subscribers, 1,000 corporate subscribers (bars, restaurants, ad agencies, etc.) and 10,000 hotel rooms. The company has over 400 employees.

In the future, each Manhattan Cable subscriber will have a tiered addressable converter. This means each subscriber has a unique address (for billing and signal transmission purposes) and will enable us to offer not only per channel viewing such as HBO and Showtime (each of which uses one channel full time) but also pay-per-view programming. That is, a viewer can elect to view a particular program for a particular price. If the subscriber wishes to see a program offered on a pay-per-view basis, he will call the company to request it, and an electronic gate will be opened through the telephone line, enabling the subscriber to receive the program.

The addressable converter will increase our flexibility and will broaden the offerings available to our subscribers. In some cases, pay-per-view is offered as part of an interactive or two-way system[1] and although certain parts of our system are interactive, we do not anticipate this as a system-wide feature in the near future.

---

[1] An interactive or two-way cable system is one that permits a signal to travel from the subscriber to the central originating equipment (called the headend.) In most cable systems, the signal travels only in one direction: from the headend or point of origin to the subscriber. Two-way, interactive cable permits the subscriber to "talk back" to the cable company. It also allows the cable company to ascertain at any given moment whether a particular television is turned on and if it is, to what channel it is tuned.

Statement by Vivian Horner

The Opportunities Within the Economic Realities: I will explore what opportunities there are, based on realities. The first thing to remember is that cable is not television. Television is one of the services that cable provides, but it provides other services as well. The economics of cable are different from those of television.

Let's take a look at the economics of cable. Les Brown said that 54 channels will be the standard offered and over 100 will be the maximum. Let's assume 60 channels as in the Cincinnati Qube system. There are 60 channels to be programmed 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. That is 526,000 hours of programming. Let's say I have $1 million to spend for programming which would be a high budget for cable. That gives me an average of $1.90 per hour to spend for programming.

The most important fact of cable economics is that the source of revenue is the subscriber. At present, almost all the revenues of the cable industry come from the people who pay for the monthly service.

Qube and the Columbus Audience: Another reality: do not believe all media reports you hear about cable. Qube (the Warner Amex two-way, interactive system) has not changed lives in Columbus. Qube can tell us how many households are watching and when. Therefore we know the size of audiences for each program or channel. We are able to keep track of audience habits, sizes, likes, dislikes, interests, and so forth, because we are able to monitor on a regular basis. We have found from our Columbus Qube that people watch the network affiliates more often than anything else.

We also know that cable subscribers tend to be television freaks. This knowledge is used by all programmers, who "strip out" certain varieties of program to program "vertical services," like all-movies or all-news.

The cable business wants to provide alternatives to the viewer. The question is, how to program for cable within economic reality. Revenues must be high enough to make producing for cable possible. Then we can earn more revenue by putting the programming into circulation in all kinds of markets. It may be good business to produce very specific offerings marketable through various distribution means.

Satellite delivery of programming and the capacity to bill the subscriber on a per-program basis both offer new opportunities for programmers. Pay-per-view will be good for cultural programming. Cultural programming will probably be very specific in its appeal. If we suppose that one half of one percent of all cable subscribers might buy cultural programs on a per-program basis, when our pay-per-view "theatre" has two million "seats," cultural programming may begin to make some economic sense.

The motivation of the entrepreneurs now entering the cultural field really does not matter, because the important thing is to establish the cable

capacity. The race will be to the swift. Children's programming is something that everyone feels is an essential on cable, very much because of Warner Amex's early programming. Culture, if the early attempts are successful, will follow the same pattern. Cultural programs will be seen as a vital part of cable's offerings.

The creative community must come to realize that the cable industry operates on an economic base very different from film and television. Television and film economics are based on scarcity of outlet and are financed very differently. Cable is a medium of plenty. If cable is to develop, enhance, and serve cultural programming, then the cable industry and the creative community will need to work hand-in-hand. A cooperative effort that recognizes cable's economic realities, and does not force agreements based on television and film precedents, will be required.

Question and Answer Session

Summary of Some of the Issues Raised by Panelists by Lawrence B. Hilford: Will the arts be presented on cable as a pay alternative, or will arts programming be advertiser supported? If the arts are to be advertiser supported, they will need a larger audience than if they are pay supported.

Everyone is getting into the cable business; some will not survive.

As a potential producer, do you go to a system operator or to a producing network? For the most part individual systems do not have the resources to produce their own programming on a significant level. The producing network is the major investor at the moment, and due to the very high cost of producing cultural programs, for the next few years, much cultural programming on cable will probably be imported from other countries.

Hilford: John Gault, assume that your channel capacity is tight and two people come to you with advertiser supported arts programming. Which would you choose and on what basis?

Gault: Almost every cable operator has to provide variety and eclectic offerings. Certain offerings are hard to get; we would choose at least one of the ad supported arts services, and we would use the results of our market research to determine which service would better meet our subscribers' desires.

Hilford: Assume that two competing pay arts systems approach you. How would you make your decision then?

Gault: We have sophisticated ways of determining what will be accepted by our subscribers. We would use market projections to make clear the amount of audience appeal each service would have. The decision would then be made on the basis of which service will provide the greatest profit margin.

Hilford: It's important to note, then, that price is important, that the cable operator will decide on the basis of profit margin.

Horner: We have to remember that cable is not television. Cable must create an alternative viewing situation. Convenience is a major aspect of cable's purpose. Networks do not repeat programs. Cable tries to expose material to the maximum number of people to deliver service to everyone who could be interested in that program. For example, a cable system may show one program seven days in a week, each day at a different time. This makes the program available conveniently. The concepts of "runs" and "residuals" do not work for cable. For example, in cable programming one run might be 20 - 40 days with repeats as often as possible.

Hilford: The implication of what you just said is that for every 30 days, there is actually five to six days of programming.

Horner: On one of our channels for Qube, we discovered that we needed about 50 original hours of programming per month. We could be more selective with that volume of programming, and we could publicize that volume well. The time slot for each program is rotated through the days and day parts to maximize convenience for the viewer.

Hilford: Exclusivity is an issue for arts groups and arts programmers to consider seriously. If a cable network wants exclusivity for your program, how much will you demand for this exclusivity? Do you want to limit your possible exposure to only one cable service? Cable companies are attempting to get total exclusivity for their arts programming and this will limit the amount of exposure available to arts groups.

Market Analysis

Chair:
Charlotte Schiff Jones
Vice President for Marketing, CBS Cable

Panelists:
Larry W. Howe
Vice President, Corporate Development, American Television and Communications Corporation
Robert H. Alter
President, Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau

Statement by Charlotte Schiff Jones

I am a believer in cable, an idealist. I believe that narrowcasting is a reality today. Up to now, cable has done little more than deliver clear signals, but today, narrowcasting, the electronic magazine in the sky, is becoming a reality with the new cable networks: USA, Black Entertainment Network, CBS Cable, and more.

My experience at Teleprompter as Director of Community Programming. with our Bulgarian Hour Program was a lesson in cable. In 1971, Teleprompter broadcast a Bulgarian Hour over its public access channel. That program probably reached a total of 125 people -- all Bulgarian -- in New York City. That's narrowcasting: each of those 125 people paid $6.00 a month for Teleprompter's basic service which also brought them the Bulgarian Hour. This $6.00 was subscriber revenue that might not have come in otherwise.

The speed of change in the field during the last ten years is mind-boggling. Five to 10 years ago, cable operators had 5, 10, 15, or 20 channels to fill and no idea what to do with them. Five years ago, the operators used UPI news services, weather wheels, and the like to fill their channels. Cable operators are more sophisticated now -- they are dealing with programming, marketing, and advertising. All the channels are now perceived as precious and valuable. In looking at potential programs, the cable operator will ask (1) will it bring me more subscribers (lift), (2) will it help me keep the subscribers I have (retention) and (3) will it bring me incremental revenue? Pay channels such as Showtime and Home Box Office have certainly brought the operator lift and incremental revenue.

Thus far, cable has penetrated approximately 50 percent of the homes passed. Why only 50 percent? Some think this may be because the basic service obligation of cable has been neglected, while too much attention has been paid to pursuing pay channels for incremental revenue. It may now be time to build up the missing 50 percent a segment at a time through specialized program services (not necessarily Bulgarian -- but similarly vertical in nature).

The CBS channel will be a basic service. CBS feels that there is a "light-viewing" audience that will be attracted to their arts programming and will take the basic cable service in order to get CBS programming. Some MSO's have asked us to become a pay service, because of incremental revenue, but we feel this is a short-sighted approach. We need to have the time to have the viewer sample and experiment, and for us to develop our service. We want the opportunity to attract an audience that may not automatically know that it wants cultural programming. We think there are people who valued the performing arts at some time in their lives but lost track of that interest. Take, for example, the people who rediscovered ballet through The Turning Point. We believe these people can be brought back to the arts by the right kind of packaging and promotion.

CBS sensed that this audience existed, we hadn't researched it. It was a "belly button" feeling. Research since then has reinforced that judgment. We see this also as a part of the country's return to traditional values and a yearning for historical perspective.

Statement by Larry W. Howe

In this session on market analysis, the cable manager is the primary market the performing arts must first reach. In the next few minutes, I'd like to share some perspectives of a cable manager -- deciding how to use his/her channel space.

Cable should be a natural medium for the delivery of information and entertainment about, or in support of, "The Arts." To give you a better understanding of how we can work together, I'd like to discuss our primary financial needs and yours.

Cable is a natural because:

·Our imperative is to maximize the use of a broadband service -- one that is directly and efficiently in opposition to the broadcast economics of "normal TV." "Normal TV" -- ownership and control of a single channel -- demands that you maximize the audience -- make it big and universal to return the most revenue on your capital base. "CATV" is the ownership and control of a multiple channel service, that is largely subscriber vs advertiser supported (around 97-99% today). CATV demands that we maximize subscriptions and service to those who pay us, our subscribers.

·Thus, any service under today's business plan of monthly payment for basic and/or pay TV that stimulates a renewal or check-writing response is potentially valuable to us. We'll carefully review any service that draws new subscribers into our video/information store -- that increases our return on cable's enormous "increased subscriber life" -- retention, or more purchases (in the case of Pay TV or Pay/View).

In general, our target market is 100 percent of TV households in each of our franchises:

1) For basic service, ATC now reaches 52 percent of all households in all of its markets nationwide. That means we haven't found a way to attract the other 48 percent to the cable.

2) For Pay TV -- ATC reaches 31 percent of all its households nationwide. Many are now taking more than one service.

And this doesn't include many new services such as security, text, other data stream services that may not relate to this discussion.

Remember, we want to stimulate a new and regular cash response from more households. One good event or experience a month may be all we need. Your needs and ours may be similar -- you need more subscribers/seats filled -- steady and/or incidental income to offset rising expenses. How can we work together?

Through cooperation and creative partnerships -- CBS Cable, ABC, Bravo -- we can expand our membership ranks jointly:

·Events -- national, regional local -- if they transfer to live TV or videotape, may increase your market awareness -- and stimulate seat or season ticket sales.

·Joint marketing -- subscriber/membership "deals" -- could add value to each of our base memberships.

1) You could offer reduced cable installation to your member rosters -- you market for us. This assumes that you've got homes that don't now subscribe to cable -- they're "bored with TV" -- "nothing to attract me" -- "too busy," active. You may give us something to attract these doers, community leaders. We should study our different subscriber lists.

2) We could offer reduced arts/cultural membership rates, coupons, "special deals" using video ads, bill stuffers, program guides. We can expand your marketing universe.

   Our most valued relationship is with the communities and individuals we serve; it's the only one we have, and if we can enhance it through life-style improving services, we all benefit.

3) Local origination -- ATC will have around 58 studios, staffed, by the end of the year -- reaching 80 percent of our subscriber base, not including systems with community facilities also feeding our systems. Let's use them jointly.

4) Corporate citizenship? ATC, the nation's largest cable operator, serving 126 communities, with nearly 1.5 million basic and over 1 million pay subscribers, also has 3800 employees nationwide. We all live and work in your towns. ATC and its subsidiaries last year contributed $150,000 to non-profit institutions (many of them performing arts).

   This does not include Time, Inc.'s matching funds (3 for $1) program, which allows ATC employees to stimulate additional dollars in direct grants to institutions such as yours. Nor does it include Time, Inc.'s direct contributions to national or regional programs.

A Cautionary Note: There must be spirit -- on your part, on the part of potential service providers, of cooperation, of joint development of this new market for both of us: We at ATC refuse to be passive partners, simple conduits of "something." We learned early in the Pay TV business not to turn over that piece of our future to an outside party. All of our productive service ventures recognize the absolute necessity for joint control, participation, contribution to quality marketing, production, service delivery -- the "goodwill" of our subscriber is key to our success.

Cable may not be a "pot of gold" -- nothing is assured. We know a lot about "minor market" operations and some at ATC think -- more than we want to know about "major market" possibilities. The economics of current franchising are enough to cause anyone's calculator to burn out, with the costs of construction skyrocketing -- the demands for "freebies," cuts of our revenue, extraordinary channel capacity and large production capability -- we're not sure it's a business anymore. But if that's the case, we may be in the same sinking boat.

My assumptions -- and those of ATC -- are that broadband communications -- if shrewdly, carefully, diligently developed -- is a good business in any community -- but not on any terms. We jointly need to agree and pursue those conditions that make our economic futures secure and productive. I think it can be done. I know it's not always easy. ATC and Time, Inc. want to make it happen.

Statement by Robert H. Alter

I administer the Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau, a newly formed trade association geared to promoting advertising on cable. I came to cable from radio which is 100 percent supported by advertising. Cable now derives roughly two percent of its revenue from advertising.

Advertising certainly will be an increasingly important force on cable. The performing arts have a love-hate relationship with advertisers, but there is no question that advertising and cultural programming will have to fuel each other to bring cultural programs to cable.

Everyone sees that cable has tremendous potential, but as Mike Slosberg of Wunderman, Ricotta and Kline said of cable today: "it is as if someone had invented the Cuisinart food processor a year before the discovery of electricity."

This is the first time in communications history that one medium has grown as cable has without depending on advertising revenue. But now there are projections that by the end of this decade, 20 percent of cable programming will be supported by advertising. Cable operators, themselves, are open-minded about advertising. Some have sought or are already involved in joint ventures with advertisers.

One of the questions advertisers ask most frequently about cable is, where will the software come from to fill the channel capacity? This will not be a problem -- cable will not need the mass appeal programming that is required to attract advertisers to network television. Cable's strength and attractiveness to the advertiser will be in its selective audience appeal. Cable will carry material that attracts selective segments of the population which specific advertisers want to reach.

Don Johnson, President of J. Walter Thompson, said:

> Today we are on the threshhold of the most complex and comprehensive media revolution of all....Previous media revolutions were quite different from this one, because they represented a consolidation of audiences. First newspapers built a larger and larger audience, then magazines, then radio, then television. A new medium might take its audience away from an old one, but the direction was always the same -- larger and larger audiences until television brought the largest audience of all. The direction of the new media is exactly the opposite -- instead of consolidation, fragmentation. Smaller and smaller audiences, more and more sharply defined by their interests and attitudes.

The cost of sophisticated cable systems: the building, maintainence, new services, will continue to grow. The revenue a cable operator derives from advertising is the only non-subscriber revenue available, and no one knows at this point how high the subscriber will go in payment for additional tiers of programming above the basic service. At some point, consumer resistance sets in. That is where advertising fits into cable's marketing mix.

Where will the advertising dollars come from? The commercially supported networks will be attracting more national advertising dollars as their penetration grows and their value gains greater acceptance. These networks will generate local revenue, because they will make a certain amount of time available for local advertising. For example, CBS Cable will turn one minute per hour over to the local operator for local ads. Local origination cable programming will also attract advertisers. Some systems are beginning to program local news with success. The "interconnect" is emerging as still another way of packaging cable for advertisers. This involves connecting groups of separate cable systems so that an advertiser can, with one order, buy a specific geographic area. Interconnects will make cable an attractive spot medium for national and regional advertisers.

Fragmented audiences are hard to sell to the advertiser, and the arts audience is fragmented. To return to Don Johnson, he has said that advertising is

> accustomed to dealing with certainty, the measurable, the guaranteeable. Now they face a situation in which risk-taking is the only prudent course. And one of the risks, inevitably, is that of being wrong. We are charting a seemingly unpredictable marketplace in order to develop the tools with which to predict it.

And that is what makes cable so exciting.

Question and Answer Session

Question: I'm a little confused by what I have heard about money here. How can cable afford to produce theatre for television?

Jones: We're going to spend more than $2.00 an hour for our programs. CBS expects to pay a reasonable amount for the first three to four years of our arts service. Our programming now ranges from $25,000 to $400,000 per hour. We expect that will probably grow as we get some black ink.

Question: How can the people here get into the cable market?

Howe: Locally originated programming is one way. It does not cost an enormous amount to produce some things, and we have to break old molds.

Question: I have an extraordinary repertory company. Where do I go to get it on cable?

Horner: The first question is whom do you want to reach, the world or Houston?

Question: My primary aim is to earn money.

Horner: How much? For national exposure, go to a national service; for West Overshoe, go to the local cable operator to help you get local visibility. For example, promote yourself via cable or set up cooperative discount programs -- subscribers to your cultural program get a discounted cable hook-up; subscribers to cable get a discount on your cultural package.

Hilford: There is a great deal of money in this business. CBS and Bravo will have multi-million dollar budgets into the future. It's easy to sell national stars -- harder to sell regional based programming, but Bravo just taped Ballet West, for example. Arts organizations are going to have to recognize that it takes patience and persistence.

Question: What percentage of your budgets is being spent here as opposed to overseas?

Jones: CBS' program schedule will consist of approximately 60 percent original productions and 40 percent acquisitions. Most acquisitions will be of foreign produced material.

Question: Should we approach advertisers on an institutional basis or on a per program basis?

Alter: You have to go for both. Some agencies may want to sell a general concept with specific programming. For example, Capezio may sponsor a dance performance and not even show ads. If the audience is specific, the message will be implicit and therefore effective. Image selling may be the most desirable.

Question: How is the size of an audience determined?

Alter: We are currently setting up methodology studies. We are concerned about having traditional measuring techniques forced on cable, because it is a totally different situation, probably closer to magazines. Testing is difficult.

Horner: In the early days, we did a survey to find out what kinds of things our potential consumers were interested in. There is zero correlation between what they said they wanted and what they actually watch, as measured by Qube.

Question: Do you intend to produce or do you want to have material already produced?

Hilford: Rainbow is going around the country seeking packages. We just did an opera at Indiana University. We are becoming involved in program development with regional groups: theatre, dance, opera, and symphonies.

Jones: CBS is doing that also, but less than Rainbow.

Horner: Don't cut out the local cable operator. With a sold out stadium, Ohio State University will allow the local cable company to cablecast a game and split the proceeds. Nickelodeon, a national rock star, and the cable programming group were also able to work out a mutually beneficial deal in Columbus. Creative piecing together can be done with local systems.

Question: We're getting very different stories about money. How much money is there, really?

Jones: That is an impossible question to answer, really. It depends upon the circumstances. If it is a local company that wants to go on a local origination channel with a local cable company, a lot of creative effort has to happen. If it is a national situation which attracts the attention of a CBS, Bravo, then it is up to the company to make the decision how much to invest in the effort.

Hilford: In a sense you can say how much money is there. You can say there is a quarter of a billion dollars being spent this year that will flow back to program suppliers. I get that figure by taking roughly 10 million subscribers for the year at roughly $25 per year per subscriber that goes back to the national program services and to the program supplier. But that does not answer your question because most of that does not go to the original production; it goes for acquisition of produced material.

Question: How do you as a cable operator decide what to offer?

Howe: Decisions are made system by system. Conditions differ city to city. An MSO does not make a monolithic decision as to what its various cable systems will offer. It cannot. The local cable operator has to make those decisions.

Question: Arts organizations have cash problems and are looking for earned income. Some need immediate earned income. If, as Dr. Horner says, we have to compromise on negotiations, and we have only our performances to sell, and this is essentially a disposable product, and we are concerned about the future life of our productions, why should we sell our productions to you?

Hilford: I do not agree that the programming is disposable. You have to be careful in your negotiations as to what you are negotiating away -- not so much the number of days of play, but in terms of the number of years. Bravo is deficit financing at this point, so will CBS be when it goes on the air. One of the ways we hope to recoup that is by taking the program that we've lost a lot of money producing and repeating it again in 2½ years. We had to have something in order to start our programming, so we've invested in productions. If you want to give away 20-year rights, that's very valuable to us. The second area is ancillary rights. Is there a video disc market? Is there a video cassette market? And if there is for your kind of programming, what are the sharing arrangements? And that will vary in every deal from every company. There will never be a book written on that, because it depends on the relative hunger and skill of the negotiators.

Horner: This is a high risk business. All of us are involved in deficit financing. In high risk ventures, everyone shares the risk. Then you also share the profits. Everybody is afraid of being ripped off, and indeed some people will be ripped off. But some people are going to get very rich.

The New Channels

Chair:
Lou Moore
President, ELM Video Theatre

Panelists:
Jack Healy
Vice President, Product Development and Acquisition for ABC Video Enterprises
Lewis L. Lloyd
The Entertainment Channel, A Service of RCTV
Marc Lustgarten
President, Bravo
Fern McBride
Director of Program Development, East Coast Showtime Entertainment
Suzanne Weil
Director, PTV-1 (PBS)
Arthur Whitelaw
Director of Theatre Development, HBO
Jack Willis
Vice President, Programming and Development, CBS Cable

Statement by Lou Moore

It is a pleasure to see so many friends and colleagues in the audience, and I am honored to have such distinguished guests here on the platform with me today. First let me introduce you to my company, ELM Video Theatre. We represent theatres to the cable, video, and television industry. We promote our theatres to the producers, to the buyers, and the distributors. We package programs with all of these entities, and also research local cable sources for our theatres.

Today, you will be hearing from the people representing the new channels, programming services, networks. All three terms are used interchangeably to identify these new enterprises. Yesterday the panel was largely composed of cable operators, and you heard a good deal of discussion of arts organizations approaching their local cable operators. Our panelists today are the national channels; they are dealing with national programming and national scale production budgets.

Statement by Arthur Whitelaw

I have been Director of Theatre Development with Home Box Office for nine months and will begin by telling you how I learned about Home Box Office. In 1976, I subscribed to HBO; that was my introduction to pay television. HBO brought me movies at first, and later the same year it started programming specials: Bette Midler and Diana Ross. These specials had a perceived ticket value for me. They were live entertainment, something I might have gone out and paid for, but didn't because it was coming to me over HBO, and there were no commercials.

I became very interested in how this might work for theatre. If theatre was exposed through this medium, the result might be like it was for sports exposure on television. Television increased the live spectator audience for sports by introducing people to unfamiliar sports. I think it is possible to do the same thing for theatre via cable.

History of HBO: HBO was founded in 1972 with 365 subscribers in Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania. Today, it is in 50 states and will have close to seven million subscribers by the end of August. The turning point for HBO came in 1976 when the company decided to go on satellite to distribute its programming. Satellite distribution enabled HBO to become profitable, and today it is one of the few companies in the field that is making a profit.

Demographics of HBO Subscribers: The typical HBO subscriber is rural, between 18 and 35, lives in a home with three children, is a college graduate, and, based on economics alone, does not go to theatre or movies and does not buy books. The HBO subscriber watches television. He grew up with television and that is what he does for recreation.

How Will HBO Program Theatre?: Audience building for theatre among HBO subscribers will have to be done slowly. I like to cite the work done by John Jory in developing Actors Theatre of Louisville. He began by doing old familiar plays people would be comfortable with. Once the people got used to attending his theatre, he could introduce new plays because he had an audience. What I am doing now is building audiences for theatre on HBO. We will do this with events: plays with recognizable titles and/or names. Once we have established an audience, we will do what I want to do which is new plays with new actors. That's what I'm about at HBO, and what my area is working for.

The Prospects for Theatre: Someone asked yesterday, "What will all this," meaning the cable developments, "do for us?" For the regional theatres, it may extend the life of the theatre: through the new medium and through the proceeds from the sales of ancillary rights to video and cassette companies. Additionally, I see the possibility of extending the life of each production. There will be no closing nights; the life of each production will be preserved through the permanent record created of the work, and theatres will be paid for all of that.

Statement by Marc Lustgarten

Targeted Services: Bravo sort of backed into cultural programming; this is how: it began when targeted services became feasible. Targeted services are those aimed at a very small segment of the marketplace. Two technologies make it feasible to deliver targeted services: the invention of the addressable converter and the satellite delivery of programming. Before the converter, the only pay services that were financially sound were those which were very broadly popular, such as the movie services. The converter boxes made it possible to deliver more variety, and the satellite made it possible to reach more people. Now it is feasible to offer lots of different services in addition to the basic. Satellite distribution has enabled Bravo to reach a potential 20 million homes. Therefore

if we can get some small percentage of those homes, it can still be a financial success. We are in this for the money; we are in business to make a profit.

Initiating Cultural Programming: We asked our subscribers what they wanted, and cultural programming kept coming up in the responses. So we've tried to program to meet this desire.

Our first decision was whether to be a basic or a pay service. If the service was going to be a basic one (that is, included in the basic cable package without an additional fee), it would not bring the programmer and the cable operator direct revenue through subscription fees. The revenue would have to come from advertisers. But, historically, ad revenues have not supported arts programming. There was no reason to believe they would now.

Our company's Chief Executive Officer, Charles Dolan, had started HBO and therefore knew the pay television business. So, based on his knowledge and experience, a decision was made for Bravo to be a pay service.

As a result, it does not matter how many people watch our channel at any given time. This is a real difference between us and the commercial networks. We are not selling a variety of products and therefore having to maintain a constant viewing audience. Our concern is whether the subscriber will find the programming valuable enough to renew the service next month. One play or concert per month, if it is important enough to the subscriber, may assure this. For example, our first program opening night on Bravo was a Carnegie Hall tribute to Aaron Copland. Carnegie Hall was sold out for the event long in advance, and since many of our subscribers live outside of New York and find it difficult to attend such an event, many people found that single program valuable enough to cause them to renew their subscriptions.

Bravo began by programming two nights a week. We are now expanding to seven nights a week. We started in a limited way so we could find out what worked. When it came time to expand our programming, we looked at all kinds of alternatives and decided to add films, but films that were unavailable on other services, such as La Cage Aux Folles, Breaker Morant, Bread and Chocolate. We considered reinforcing the entertainment focus of Bravo, and rejected that idea as one already being done on commercial television.

The Nature of Bravo's Programming: In addition to the dance, opera, and theatre performances that we put on, we have an arts magazine which attempts to remove some of the mystique that surrounds the arts for the ordinary person. We have gone to Boston, for example, to document the arts life of that city -- museums, a chamber orchestra, Brustein at Harvard. We are jointly producing a series with a German company on "A Day in the Life of New York City Opera with Beverly Sills." We have also done a series on Jacques D'Amboise and his work interesting children in dance. Bravo is the first cable service to make stereo sound available. The

cable box is hooked to the stereo in the home, and the audio signal is delivered through the cable.

What Can You Do To Help Us?: Two things: first, let us know what you do. Second, let us know what is going on in your arts community. Our new magazine show is a natural medium to carry arts news. We are especially interested in knowing the arts activities in communities where we have local cable owners.

Statement by Fern McBride

Pay cable has, for me, the same kind of excitement that Public TV had when it started. The thought is that we will do the programming that cannot be found elsewhere on the air. The potential is there. It remains to be seen just how different we will become. One area where there is a difference between cable and the networks is sex; you can open the door to the bedroom a little wider on cable.

Showtime's Programming: Movies are the major force on Showtime, and we do a very good job with them. The challenge for Showtime is in original programming. Showtime was the first pay television service to present theatre. This is a very challenging area: to put theatre on television successfully. Showtime was also the first to present a comedy series; it's called Bizarre. Comedy is very important to us. You will see Burlesque and comedy in the Burlesque style on Showtime.

In the area of informational programming, Showtime has a development deal with Psychology Today. This has the potential for being very innovative programming.

Showtime functions under the shadow of HBO to a certain extent. For example, Showtime will begin 24-hour broadcasting on the Fourth of July, and when we announced this at the recent NCTA Convention, the press presented it in the context of HBO's going 24-hours on the first of January.

Showtime's Subscribers: Showtime has 1.8 million subscribers across the country. They are high school-educated, have incomes of $15,000 and up, and the median age is 34. That is the limit of our knowledge. We don't have an exact profile of our subscribers yet.

Prospects for Arts Programming on Showtime: There is a limit to the amount of innovation that can be done by a service all at once. Probably the wisest course will be to do one or two areas very well and to continue to build from there. Showtime wants to present popular entertainment; we are not emphasizing high culture as one might expect from RCTV or CBS Cable.

Statement by Suzanne Weil

PBS Today: There is a great deal written these days about the demise of PBS. We are not dying, and except for very real problems -- Federal budget cuts, to mention one -- we are in good shape. As a matter of fact, we are just about to announce our new season of Fall programming to the press.

Cable is always cited as a potential cause of the death of PBS, but we see cable as one of the forces that will help us to stay alive. Foundation and Federal support are diminishing, so we are looking elsewhere for continuing future support.

PBS and Cable: PBS is already actively involved in cable. Many stations are already producing for cable. Soundstage, for example, produced two shows, one for HBO and one for PBS. In acquisitions, PBS has co-sponsored, co-produced, and bought programs. No one has enough money for production these days, so we are all involved in cooperative deals.

PBS is made up of 280 locally controlled stations. Some are located in areas without cable. Some are actually operating cable channels. Cincinnati, for example, is operating seven cable channels in addition to their VHF channel. They rent the local cable company's studio space and share production expertise and talent. So, on a local level, cable has been an important source of funding and new program opportunities for PBS.

PBS is not concerned about the cable window, i.e., PBS programming being shown on cable, since the audience overlap is almost negligible. The big audience numbers on cable are under 10 million. We are reaching 42 million each week on PBS; that is more than half of all television homes, and our prime time audience is up 70 percent over the last two years.

Sue Weil's Missionary Campaign: I am going to do my missionary thing now, and it is that every major arts organization should have a television person. All arts organizations have development people; they should also have television people who know about putting the work on television. The dance field started early and now is rich in people who are prepared to put dance on television. Merce Cunningham has someone on his staff; Twyla Tharp directs her own material for television, and Mr. Balanchine just made his first piece, L'enfant, for television. The real breakthrough will occur when the choreographers and directors are able to transfer their own work to television.

The Grand Alliance/Public Subscriber Network: You have all been hearing about this in the press. It is in the very early stages of exploration -- a pay cable network that would be part of the public television system. It would involve a working relationship between stations in the Public Broadcasting System, independent producers, and arts organizations. It is viewed as a limited partnership and is being researched extensively now.

Research shows us that there is a market for high quality arts events. There is a small, passionate audience that will pay for these events. The kind of programming we are talking about is a box office service, one major arts event or major lecture a night that will be repeated.

There has been a great deal of speculation about this partnership. Part of the plan has been for arts organizations to buy shares at $5,000. With everyone concerned about money, this has been a red flag. We are looking at it, and if it is a bad idea, we'll drop it. If it is a good idea, but not possible for the arts organizations, we'll look for a foundation to subsidize it. We are moving very slowly on this idea. We are surveying arts organizations now, and I would like to hear what you want to see and what are your questions.

We at PBS know what it is like to be a nonprofit organziation. We do not think of the arts as commodities. We want to give artistic control to your organization. Your having a television person on your staff would help us to do that.

Statement by Lewis L. Lloyd

RCTV -- The Entertainment Channel -- is a pay television company which will distribute its programs via satellite. The company is owned by RCA and Rockefeller Center, Inc. At present a small company, it will soon be much larger. Its audience goals are more limited than those of the companies that supply feature films. The theory behind the company, which we think is sound, is a tie-in between a regular supply of high quality programming at a predictable price (through our agreement with the BBC) and revenue from a pay system through subscriber fees.

RCTV Programming: The programming will be varied, running daily from 5 PM to midnight and longer on weekends. Twenty percent of the programming will be classic feature films, 20 percent will be children's programming developed especially for RCTV by American producers and 20 percent will be cultural.

There will be a major musical event a month on the order of Live From Lincoln Center, and there will be a major American theatre production monthly. There will also be between 12 and 20 magazine programs which we are coproducing with London Weekend. The remaining 40 percent of the programming will be supplied by the BBC and other UK producers, London Weekend, Granada, and Thames.

The key to our service is exclusivity. Programs seen on RCTV will not be available elsewhere or will be seen first on RCTV and later on PBS. RCTV will accept institutional or advocacy-type commercials, not so much for the revenue but to establish the relationship between the sponsor and the program. Arthur Taylor calls it "parenting." RCTV programs will be distributed via satellite and perhaps in the beginning through STV systems, because some major cities lack cable systems.

The critical question, of course, is how do we get the financing organized for a program service that wishes to produce a large amount of original programming? We are looking for co-production relationships with home video suppliers, UK producers, and PBS.

Statement by Jack Willis

CBS Cable will be going on the air on Columbus Day, October 12th. I want to caution you, there has been a tremendous amount of hype. We are all engaged in the battle of the press release trying to establish ourselves in a marketplace that is not yet defined, so you must be careful to assess what you need.

CBS Broadcasting Schedule: CBS will broadcast 12 hours a day, seven days a week. Of that twelve hours, three will be original programming produced or co-produced by CBS. This three hours of programming repeats twice every evening and on the following day, so the schedule runs as follows: original programming is first shown from 7 to 10 PM, then is repeated from 10 PM to 1 AM and 1 AM to 4 AM. The same programming is shown the following day from 4 PM to 7 PM, when the next block of original programs comes up. So what we have is 12 hours of programming daily -- three hours repeated four times. On a yearly schedule, there is 13 weeks of original programming repeated four times per year. That means that CBS is creating roughly 270 hours of original programming.

What Distinguishes CBS from Other Channels?: First, we are creating a network very much like the CBS commercial network with affiliates. We have three million subscribers now, and we are selling time to sponsors. Secondly, we are producing most of our own programming. We have our own production staff. Merrill Brockway for dance, Roger Englander for music, and Jon Musilli and Stephanie Sills in theatre.

Most of our dance is going to be done in-house by Merrill. A good deal of the music programming is being done the same way by Roger. Opera and symphonic music are very expensive, so we have bought a good deal of that kind of programming, because we cannot afford to produce it ourselves. American original drama is also very hard to produce, but we are developing relationships with some theatre companies. We have a right of first refusal with the Williamstown theatre, and we are talking with a number of other companies. We want to be in a position to develop scripts mutually.

Our interest is in making television a creative medium. We do not take productions directly off the proscenium. We want to create a television experience that is different from the experience in the theater. In theatre we are looking for an experience that is as distinctive as the experience Merrill Brockway created for Dance in America.

How to Approach CBS: I support Sue's missionary pitch. People come to CBS without any idea of how to put their ideas on television, and CBS does not have the staff to take material and come up with TV concepts. You will be much better received if you come to us with an idea and a television point of view. Without that, it will be difficult for us to work together.

The CBS Audience: CBS Cable is pursuing what we call an upscale audience. We feel that television can be contextless and alienating. Our aim is to make historical, economic, and social connections to provide context for the artistic events we are showing.

Statement by Jack Healy

Major companies have entered this business without knowing whether it will be profitable. We at ABC don't know if people will watch what we are putting on. All we really know about cable programming is that people will pay for movies. All the rest is assumptions.

ABC's ARTS Programming: Our service includes music, dance, and some drama. There will not be much drama, because it is so expensive to produce. We are purchasing material, but want to produce here. We are theoretically advertiser supported. I say "theoretically" because we do not have sponsors at the moment.

ABC ARTS is on Satcom 1; we piggyback onto Nickelodeon which is a children's service. We begin broadcasting at 9 PM, EST, with three hours of programming a night, seven days a week. Our repeat cycle will be seven to 10 times per year. I really do not know whether the reason for the repeat is financial or viewer convenience.

ABC's Approach to the Audience: We have done a great deal of research, including 3,000 in-home interviews. We look at our audience and try to figure out now to expand that audience. We want a soft approach to programming. "Cultural programming" has turned people off. ABC wants to show how entertaining the arts are. Our material would not have lasted for so long if it weren't very entertaining, and that is what we want to show.

One of the devices we use is theme weeks; a recent one was on Vienna, City of Genius. This provides an informational framework in which to present the cultural materials. We are not satisfied with our programs yet; we are not sure we have reached the right degree of softness of presentation.

Economics of the Arts on Cable: The validity of arts programming on cable depends on its making a profit. We must manage our business so that it moves into the black. It is a balancing act to keep the parent corporation satisfied while we refine our programming. If ABC cannot make money doing cultural programming, it will not do cultural programming.

The cable business suffers from a double bottleneck now. First, there is the wholesale bottleneck: most cable systems pick up from Satcom 1, and it is full. Second, there is the retail bottleneck: most systems have a limited number of channels available, and if they do not have the channel capacity, they cannot carry our service. These two bottlenecks will be eased within the next four to five years. New satellites are going up, and within the next five years, the major cities will be wired with up to 57 channels. Once that happens, the smaller cities will pressure their systems to expand their channel capacity.

Within the last year and a half something extraordinary has happened. Eighteen months ago, it was a seller's market for programming suppliers. Then, with ABC, CBS, and RCTV bringing whole services on line, it became a buyer's market. I think that will change as channel capacity increases.

Prospects for the Arts on Cable: We have the opportunity now to find out whether or not the market for cultural material is much larger than we have heretofore understood. ABC thinks it is. We think there is room for competition, and that competition should ultimately benefit the people here in this audience.

Question and Answer Session

Moore: A question for Lew Lloyd (RCTV), Arthur Whitelaw (HBO), and Fern McBride (Showtime). Please describe briefly the amount of performing arts programming your channel will carry and talk about some of the specifics.

Lloyd: RCTV stands midway between the movie channels and the cultural channels; that is why it's called The Entertainment Channel. RCTV will use between 550 and 600 hours of original programming per year. Each program is repeated 5 times. Of that total of programming hours, roughly 20 percent is cultural, and that breaks out as follows:

- One production a month from an American theatre,
- One production a month from a concert hall or opera house,
- We will buy one production a month off the shelf, and
- We will co-produce a magazine show of profiles of cultural figures. Shows on Robert Redford, Herbert Ross, and Bob Fosse are already completed.

So, the opportunity for performing arts organizations is limited to 24 slots: 12 for music and dance and 12 for theatre. RCTV will offer limited opportunity, very much because the audience we are seeking wants mainstream entertainment with cultural highlights.

Whitelaw: HBO is in pretty much the same position: we are a movie channel offering 12 to 15 new feature films per month and six specials a month. We will be doing six new sports programs, and in 1982, probably one play a month. HBO will differentiate itself through the specials (movies are not sold on an exclusive basis, so they cannot set apart a pay service), but we can only do things that have very broad based audience appeal.

McBride: Showtime does one Broadway production a month, one musical product a month such as Merle Haggard or Emmy Lou Harris. I expect we will be doing additional theatre, but not right away.

Moore: For all of you, (1) what is the size of your budget overall for the arts? (2) where do you expect that budget to be in two years? and (3) what are per program budgets and ranges?

Healy: I expect that budgets will grow over the next several years. They will grow as the marketplace demonstrates receptivity to viewing and as the advertiser supports it. If this doesn't happen, we will fold our tents, because this is a business.

Lloyd: It might be helpful to think of cable as not being locked into the historical time constraints of 30, 60, 90, and two hours. We have produced short segments, and this can be less expensive.

Willis: I cannot speak about CBS's overall budget figures, but our budget is adequate, and I'll give you ballparks. We are competitive with the other channels. Our programming costs range from $25,000 to $300,000 per hour. When you get beyond the $300,000 mark, you are pushing us hard. We are,

however, able to co-produce which we will be doing with Early Days, starring Ralph Richardson. Some of our costs are very high. For example, dance with isolated cameras is very expensive, so these figures reflect the cost averages between original and acquired programs.

Lloyd: Basically, RCTV's cost per hour is very much the same; it ranges from $15,000 to $300,000. But the average cost of arts programming is five times higher than other programming areas at RCTV. This does not mean, however, that we have five times as much in our arts budget.

Lustgarten: Bravo does almost all original production, although of late we have increased our acquisition. From day one, we have had an agreement with AFM which has allowed us to work on a more economical basis. We produce in-house in a highly efficient way, and can produce complete symphonic music for one third of what Channel 13 spends. We are looking for off-beat material, especially theatre. Theatre doesn't translate well, now. We need a new art form: video theatre.

Whitelaw: As far as HBO is concerned, I cannot give you figures, because it's all relative. If we were to do The Little Foxes with Elizabeth Taylor, it would cost one thing, without her, the cost would be different. Since HBO is profitable, and Time, Inc. believes in putting money back into its business, we do have a good deal of money. It will be very carefully spent.

McBride: There is a reluctance to talk about money, in part, because of negotiations. Our developmental budget at Showtime is not great. We want to have very recognizable stars and properties that will please and stimulate subscribers. We're also looking for new and innovative programming that is not terribly expensive.

The Producer's View

Chair:
Chloe Aaron
President, Chloe Aaron Associates

Panelists:
Michael Bronson
Media Development Director, Metropolitan Opera; Executive Director, Live from the Met
John Goberman
Director of Media Development for Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts; Consultant, RCTV
Jim Mervis
Vice President of Programming, CBS Video Enterprises
Bob Rubin
Vice President, Programming for Cable, Group W Cable Productions
Bill Siegler
Independent Producer ; Packager ; President, Siegler Productions

Statement by Chloe Aaron

Before we begin, let me introduce my new company to you. We are doing television consulting and production, helping performing arts centers such as the Kennedy Center adapt their programming to television so that they can reach a larger audience and increase their income. We are also developing television productions of dramatic materials, performances, and documentaries.

A brief summary of what has happened so far may be helpful to you now. Each of you may be wondering at this point whether your company can establish a beneficial relationship with a video company.

The Current Market for Arts Programs: It is clear that the market for the arts is relatively small. Showtime and HBO are not much of a market for you at this time. CBS may have some strong potential. ABC is acquiring material now and does not offer the prospect of original productions in the near future. Bravo is producing a lot of programming currently, sometimes for less than $60,000 per show. That $60,000 production budget raises a question: will there be any money left for the arts organization? At RCTV the stress will be primarily on entertainment, not the arts, and at PBS, the Public Subscriber Network or Grand Alliance, will be a long time in coming -- at least two years, maybe more.

Survival of the Arts Channels: A major question arises. How many of these arts channels can survive? Two of these networks are to be advertiser supported, yet they candidly admit that they have no advertisers yet. If there are no advertiser dollars to support the arts, why are they doing it? Les Brown suggests that it is simply a way to enter the cable field without angering affiliates. That may or may not be the case.

An audience of three to four million for a PBS production was very good. If there is an arts audience that exceeds this three to four million, we do not know how much larger it is. If it is not much larger, how will the programs be supported? The situation is different with pay cable. If you can get enough people to pay for the service, it is not dependent on audience numbers.

Statement by John Goberman

Arts programs have relatively limited audiences, and producing programs for these limited audiences will probably require a consortium of markets such as video disc, cable television, PBS, and foreign sales. Such a consortium of markets may generate the financing to create substantial programs, but these different markets require different kinds of programs, so an important question that must be faced is, to what extent does the nature of the primary market affect the content and nature of the program produced?

The Impact of Market in Programming: It is important to establish and understand the differences between the various markets, because this, in turn, will affect the nature of the programming. For basic cable, for example, it really matters who watches and how many watch. As soon as reliable ways are developed to monitor this, numbers will become increasingly important. For pay cable, on the other hand, all that matters is whether the service is bought and how many watch it, so the marquee value -- the recognizability -- of the programming becomes a primary concern. There may be more people who think they want to watch opera than really do. Those who think they want to watch opera may purchase a pay television service that provides opera simply to have the resource available in the home. If a basic channel offers opera that does not attract an audience there will be no advertisers to sponsor the opera. So these different systems may end up with very different kinds of programming.

The Role of the Producer: The key factor here is the television producer, the person whose job it is to determine the nature of the program to be produced. If the program is to be sold primarily to a video disc company, the program will be very different from one which is directed to PBS or to pay cable, and the producer must determine this.

It is important for arts institutions to recognize that there is a television point of view involved in the end product. As more and more arts institutions become involved as originators of programming, it is important that the kind of programming is determined from a television point of view and to a certain extent from the point of view of the potential market for the program.

Statement by Jim Mervis

Probably the most important thing I can tell you, and the reason why I am here is that the largest selling non-feature film cassette in the MGM-CBS library is the Bolshoi Nutcracker. It is certainly not a typical television program, and, based on this and our research, the arts will have a major role in the home video market. Fifty percent of the home video market is feature films; cultural offerings will make up a considerable part of the other 50 percent.

CBS Video is a software company only; we are not supporting any particular machine. We will produce for whatever machines are in use, for all formats, including laser discs. CBS Video will do joint productions with pay television and other cable sources; we will work very closely with CBS Cable, and sometimes we will initiate programs ourselves, putting together our own co-production packages.

Statement by Bob Rubin

I want to address the reality of the market place and the nuts and bolts of production. I heard the end of this morning's session, and it seemed to me to give an unrealistic picture of producing theatrical shows for television which is what Group W does. We create these productions not to further the arts, but to produce good and profitable programming that has viability in all the new technologies. When I hear someone say he can produce a program for $60,000, it is like hearing Sanskrit. The demands of the market place and increasing costs are such that, in my view, it is not possible to produce for that price.

The Demand for Star Performers: Let me give you an example: last year we sold a wonderful production of the Goodspeed's Little Johnny Jones to Showtime. It was not a star vehicle, and we sold it without a star. It is a wonderful show of which we are very proud, but I doubt that we could sell it to Showtime today, because it does not have stars and is not a commercial television clone. Unfortunately, cable seems to be moving in the direction of cloning commercial television.

Movies will, I think, continue to comprise at least three quarters of the mix on cable services, because non-movie programming does not have the presold, marquee value of movies. The services are now requiring star casts in their non-movie programs to assure marquee value for those programs. Marquee value can in some cases be provided by a play or a playwright, but usually it comes via a star.

Increasing Costs: This brings us to the next element in the equation: agents. Agents perceive a pot of gold in cable. During recent negotiations with an agent for a "medium" star -- not a movie star -- the agent said the star gets a $25,000 day rate. We needed the actor for 10 days of rehearsal and three days of shooting. The actor's fee would amount to more than the entire license fee for the production. The question we have to face is how high can all of this go and still leave room for a profit?

Statement by Michael Bronson

I want to raise a number of questions I think are important. I feel different here because I am the only person who is actually associated with an arts organization that brings up a curtain seven times a week.

·How many of us will be tempted to make bad deals financially?

·How many of us will be tempted to make bad deals by giving up total artistic control?

·What kind of percentage, share of revenue should your company maintain?

·Might your institution do better to negotiate directly with the talent and unions to make a package for presentation to the outside co-producer?

·Are you proceeding without sight of revenue?

·How do we use all of these developments in cable to make our organizations more healthy?

I do not know the answers, but I do know the issues need attention from those of us who work in the live performing arts.

Statement by Bill Siegler

The basic question for me is how do we get our show on the air? It is important to recognize that in answering that question, I am not necessarily talking about art. What I am talking about is taking theatre, good, viable theatre properties and translating them to television. Theatres should examine their seasons each year with an eye to what would be marketable to cable television. Marketability changes from year to year. My company, for example, produced Little Johnny Jones last year for Bob Rubin. This year we could not sell Little Johnny Jones unless it had Donny Osmond in the lead role. That is a primary consideration now in our marketing technique. Another bit of personal advice is this: if you are planning a season with a play that you want to produce for television, try to use a play by a dead playwright. Negotiations with estates is easier than negotiation with live playwrights, and living playwrights in the editing room are a real pain in the neck.

Words, Not Wizardry: If there is a theme that I would choose in talking to you today, it would be "words, not wizardry." Up to now, much of the discussion has been about wizardry. I want what we produce to have more to do with the playwright's words and the director's intentions than with camera capabilities. I know what the cameras can do; you don't necessarily. But we can work together to properly translate that entity of which you are very proud. In approaching each production, I try always to adapt televi-

sion techniques to the needs of the play. I sit down with a director and a writer that I am working on the property with and we try to decide what is the focus of the play and how to capture it. We don't capture it by hardware, we capture it by understanding. It is the play and the production that I feel most concerned about. That is the only way to produce quality programming.

Question and Answer Session

Aaron: Following the line of Mr. Siegler's last comment, this morning Marc Lustgarten said he was not satisfied by the product that resulted from taping a live theatre performance. He says that taping from a live proscenium cannot be successful. Jim Mervis has had different experiences, and I would like him to comment.

Mervis: I have two thoughts on that. Aesthetically, I agree with him. When I was at Showtime, I insisted we shoot with a full theater during live performance, but that was for a marketing reason. We were selling a live theatre event which we advertised by showing a handful of tickets. We were selling the whole experience, and to capture that, we had to shoot live with the audience.

Now that I am working in the home video industry, it is different. We are not selling the live theatre experience, we are selling a particular performance of a particular work of art. The most important thing is to give the best artistic viewpoint, so I am moving away from the idea of in-theater shooting. For home video, I am looking more toward adaptation of the work for the medium of television.

Aaron: One of the questions raised today is, why participate in any cable presentation of your organization's work? John Goberman, what benefits have there been for Lincoln Center?

Goberman: There has been some financial benefit to Lincoln Center. Certainly, there has been increased visibility which in turn increases fund-raising capacity. I can't put a number on it, but it makes a difference. Michael may have more to say on this.

Bronson: On all of our shows we offer a free teleguide to those who will write in to request it. This has generated over 550,000 names over four years, and these are added to fundraising lists to be used in one way or another. For some productions, there have also been financial proceeds from overseas sales.

Question: Bill Siegler, did you do Comden and Green and the Madwoman of Central Park West for $150,000? Would you explain and break out the figures?

Siegler: Yes, we were able to do both shows for $150,000 because we piggy-backed the production into a three-day weekend. We shot them at the John Drew Theatre in East Hampton, Long Island. This was a very efficient way to produce both shows because once you make the original outlay on the rental of the truck, for example, it pays to keep it long enough to do two shows at once, assuming all the other conditions work out properly. It is also less expensive to produce on Long Island than it is in New York City.

The figures break out roughly as follows: three days of editing at $3,000 a day, cameras and tape machines at approximately $25,000 for three days. We did not pay rental on the theater because the performances we taped were offered free to subscribers as a subscriber benefit. Don't think that if you have $75,000 you can do the same thing. This was a particularly efficient production, in large part because we could do both shows together. That is a rare occurrence and cost will vary from production to production.

Goberman: Returning to the $60,000 question raised by Bob Rubin earlier: you can do it for $60,000 if you don't pay anyone. To enter the field with $60,000 is to enter the wrong way.

Rubin: Let's take a specific example. In 1977, the American Place Theatre produced Hold Me! by Jules Feiffer. Showtime wanted the show with Paul Dooley. Their condition was that the star, Paul Dooley, remain with the show, and that worked out fine.

The basic deal was this: American Place Theatre got 10 percent of the gross license fee for creative input, directing and casting, plus a percentage of ancillary fees. Casting was to be okayed by Showtime and Feiffer. After a pay cable window of 18 months, my company retains the rights to resell the production to a network or into syndication.

The following are examples of licensing fees from last year: $250,000 for a non-musical with 4, 5, or 6 characters, one set, a comedy or melodrama. For a musical the range is $300,000 to $350,000 for a show that is not currently a hit. What is happening now is that license fees are going up rapidly, because talent and rights fees are going higher and if you can pass them along you try to do that. If the $300,000 seems high, it is about one third of what a 60-minute network variety special would be licensed for.

Question: In making a deal, is it an advantage or disadvantage to sell to cable first?

Rubin: On a major deal, you must go to pay cable, because that is the only real source of money. But -- if you can get a tape made without pre-selling, you're in a better position to negotiate a profit for your organization.

Bronson: Don't forget corporate and foundation underwriting for cable productions.

Goberman: In most instances, the cable sale has to come first. RCTV, for example, does not want to buy something that has already been shown.

Mervis: If you make a cable sale first, you increase the likelihood of a larger advance, yes, but you get better cross promotion and better marketing if you can make a simultaneous sale to cable and home video.

State of The Art

Chair:
Michael Bronson
Media Department Director, Metropolitan Opera

Panelists:
Kirk Browning
Freelance Director
Roger Englander
Senior Producer of Music, CBS Cable
David Jones
Artistic Director, BAM Theatre Company, Brooklyn, New York
Fabrizio Milano
Stage Director, Metropolitan Opera
Stan Wojewodski
Artistic Director, Center Stage, Baltimore, Maryland

Statement by Michael Bronson

Most seminars and conventions in this field have not really addressed the question of how to make the marriage between the artistic institution, its creative talents, and the television entity.

Yesterday, there was some sentiment questioning why we, representing arts institutions, should even have to do television. Well, of course we don't, but television presents some opportunities. And if we are going to take advantage of those opportunities, we should think about how we can make the best product. How can we use the skills and creative excitement we have in our institutions and translate them into television, be it standard television, cable, home video, video disc. There was some thought yesterday that the product may be different according to which market you are aiming for: a home video product would be different in kind from a pay television product. Some of the issues we will address today include: Are there different ways we should try to produce our materials and how do we make a successful collaboration between our very different art forms and television? What are some of the pitfalls? What experiences can we share? What kinds of planning should be done in the beginning?

Statement by Kirk Browning

Basically, I'm a pragmatist. Translation is not an art form; it's a craft. Television is not an art form. We have to recognize that the marriage of the performing arts and television produces a "monstrous Caliban" aesthetically. The artistic result ranges from here to there, because so much distortion results from the camera. You cannot honestly project the values of the performing arts. You will be totally frustrated if you try to represent all the values in your production.

Know Your Audience: I have learned certain lessons in transferring a product from one form to another. First you have to appraise your constituency. Who are you trying to reach? If I am doing the New York Philharmonic with Zubin Mehta conducting a piece for a convention of oboe players, I probably will not feature a french horn, because that's not where you would expect the audience to respond.

Most of my work has been for national audiences, and within those guidelines, I unashamedly confess that I will do almost anything in my power to attract as wide an audience as possible. I will use almost any device I can to try to seduce the viewer to stay with the process.

Capture the Energy: The whole process is performer-oriented. What the audience responds to is not necessarily the legitimacy of the performance but the energy in it. The key is energy. If you have a personality like Pavarotti, just get in close and show him. The chemistry is mesmerizing. This is not very subtle, just plunge in and try to involve an audience in the qualities that carry -- excitement and energy.

Statement by Fabrizio Milano

The main problem of televising opera is conceiving what the audience should see. The audience in the theater chooses from a large stage what to focus on. The television director has to make this choice for the home audience.

Establishing the Focus: Boheme was the first production of mine that was televised. That was in 1977. Fortunately we knew from the beginning that it was going to be televised, so I directed with that in mind. I tried to figure out where I wanted the focus to be, so by the time Kirk got to the job, I had already done a lot of thinking. We were also fortunate with the original design of the production because the color and the space were good.

Kirk is right. You cannot get the entire spectrum of the opera on television. What you can get is the extraordinary energy of particular performers. So, instead of trying to capture the expanse of the second act of Boheme you may focus on certain principals. Certain opera singers have fine acting technique, and it communicates on camera. In some cases the entire body, face, hands, and arms become an expression of the musical impulse. They communicate through every resource they have in their bodies. That excitement, intensity, and energy can seduce an audience to stay with you. They can also compensate for not being able to give the full panorama.

When you have a large, long crowd scene like the 20 minute opening scene in Cavalleria Rusticana, details must be choreographed, building sequence by sequence. You make a mosaic of detail with the camera -- it is like constructing a microcosm of the larger whole.

The Audience Experience: You must also be aware that the taping will alter the audience experience the night of the taping and the night of the dress rehearsal. Lighting must be much brighter than normal, and you cannot use scrims. Let the audience know it is being taped live for nationwide broadcast, if that is what is happening; perhaps this will help make up for the changed character of the experience.

Looking at it from the other perspective, the presence of an audience severely limits camera placement and the number of placements. At the Met we cannot get the central camera into a good position. Maybe someday it will be possible to do what Covent Garden does. They make their tapings special, low priced events. They set up the event around the television requirements. This means they can do anything they want to with lights and camera placements.

Statement by Stan Wojewodski

When I came to this conference, I was looking for what was in cable for me and my theatre in terms of money or artistic challenge. Although I have given over those thoughts, I cannot help feeling that my destiny as a theatre person is somehow tied up with cable.

Working with the Maryland Center: A few years ago, the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting -- the people who bring you Wall Street Week and Consumer Survival Kit -- approached me and asked me if I'd like to develop something for Public Television that, if it went well, would have some sort of national life. I took the plunge, and we developed two short stories for television, Bartelby the Scrivener which Israel Horovitz adapted and An Apple, An Orange, a Diane Johnson short story. I directed Bartelby and Jeff Bleckner directed the Johnson piece.

I had a really good time. The collaboration with Horovitz was thoroughly satisfactory. The casting was interesting, and I collaborated with the television director from the Maryland Center, and that was a very exciting experience for me. The programs were aired locally and nationally to marvelous notices and awards.

They invited me to continue the series, and this time I chose a Ring Lardner story and asked Robert Allen Ackerman to direct and was involving name actors. We began working with the design which we felt had been the weakest part of the original project. The Maryland Center staff designers had long been designing sets for Wall Street Week, Consumer Survival Kit, and Hodge Podge Lodge. They felt that this project was their chance to "do art." They also saw it as a kind of reward. But they didn't know how to design for theatre on television, and on the first project I was able to save the day by refusing to shoot on the set until it was changed. That worked because they had no choice. At one point, when I was editing in the booth, my assistant heard one of them say, "Look at that stuff; all you can see is the actors." I should have known then that I was in for trouble.

After having set up everything for the second project, I received a letter saying state funds had been frozen for all who were not on the state payroll which incluced all of us. We were told it would be some time before this kind of project would be repeated. The project was, in fact, finished by their people, who, having watched me do one and Jeff do one, thought they knew how to do it. Then it stopped.

The people at the Center did not know how to go about the creation of original dramatic properties for television, nor were they interested in practical concerns such as the necessity of having spare boxes of cookies when you have to shoot a scene with cookies. Our success was that we showed them it could work. But they, alone, could not create and produce original dramatic properties for television. The success resulted from the collaboration.

Statement by David Jones

I'd like to talk a little about my background. I've had eight to nine years in television and thirteen in theatre in England, and this whole question of whether theatre can be made to work on television has occupied me during those years.

Reasons for Putting Your Work on Television: An examination of motivation and the audience is critical. From yesterday, you may have concluded that if your motivation is money, you are not going to get much. Money is not the main reason to do it. Going on television can give theatre groups much wider visibility -- national visibility. That can be a legitimate reason. The particular piece should be something you care about and want to reach a wider audience. I hope you'll also want to make a major contribution to television, but if you start talking about television as an art form, you can get yourself into trouble. I see them as different branches of the communications industry.

Personal Experience with Theatre and Television: I started my career at Monitor, the BBC television magazine. We featured art in all forms. For theatre, we would feature 10 to 12 minute extracts, and because we were very new and purists, we insisted on removing it from the theatre and putting it into the studio to re-pitch and re-gear it for television. One of our most successful efforts was of Zeffirelli's original stage version of Romeo and Juliet where most of the balcony scene took place in a large fourposter bed. We got marvelous camera work in, around, and under the pillows, great close-ups. Ticket sales went up enormously the next day, but then people started to get angry, because they could not get as close to the bed as the camera had done. On that job we were trying to convey the immediacy of theatre.

In 1964 I left television and went to work for Royal Shakespeare Company and commenced a long history of these so-called collaborations, or marriages, or shared bloody-minded dog fights that went on. We tried things in a number of different ways.

The War of the Roses was done by converting the Old Vic into a studio; we had total camera accessibility, but sound was a problem, and we did not have all the conveniences of the studio. With All's Well that Ends Well, we went into a studio with a top television director, but the most successful was a weird play by Marguerite Duras, very low key and intimate. When you can move in close on a play, you can get much more involved in a reconstruction of the subtext, you achieve a greater intimacy than you can on stage. No matter how you do this work, there can be problems. If you have a person of real ability in theatre moving into the medium of television, he has to learn to respect its rules.

Finally about three years ago I went back to the BBC to run something called the Play of the Month. This two-hour program takes well-known classic dramas and makes them work on television. We did plays like The Seagull and Danton's Death. Whereas when I was on the theatre side, I was always for the integrity of the production, once I started to do these plays, the fight was for the integrity of the television medium. It was not enough simply to put Danton's Death on television. One wanted to pull that play apart so that it worked in a driving kind of political way on television.

Tension Between Television and Theatre Worlds: In England, although it's begun to fade, there was for many years an undoubted emotional and artistic tension between the television and theatre worlds. On both sides of the fence, there was a disgraceful lack of awareness of just how remarkable the work is that is being done on the other side of the fence. The theatre people would say, "It's those philistine television men, and all they'll want is marvelous shots, and my production will go out the window." The television people would say "Jesus, it's those artsy farts coming in here, and they're gonna be narcissistic, and they're gonna say that beautiful moment can't be lost, and it's all gonna be impossible." One or two of us with advanced schizophrenia have sat on the top of this barbed wire fence and can still speak in a relatively low voice, but one has to have respect for both sides.

When working in television and theatre, you are looking for a marriage of the word and picture. If you just think you are pointing a camera at an event like a baseball game, you should keep out of this. But if the medium excites you, get in there fast.

Statement by Roger Englander

When addressing the question of the state of the art, I must say that television is in a very healthy state.

"Live is Dead": I would even go so far as to say, vis a vis tape and live performance, live is dead. The performance still has to exist, but have you ever considered what it takes to actually go to a performance? It costs a lot: $50 at the Met if you want to get a good seat. You have to brave the crowds and possible muggings, and you have to dress, that is, wear a tie. I'd much rather stay at home and watch some television, if it is well done.

My field is music. There are two aspects to music: the abstract, reportage, background, concepts and the like. There is also music with a story, as in ballet and opera and new and wonderful combinations. I don't really like abstract music. I'd much rather be an audience to story-connected music, because the original entertainment was story telling around the fire. Then those stories were put to music. I think the most exciting thing on television today is opera. Opera in English is the way to achieve larger audiences on television in opera. Summer and Smoke, for example, is terrific and it is in English.

Project X: About 15 years ago I did a project, called Project X, at CBS. It was a secret project involving Vladimir Horowitz. For 20 years, people had tried to tempt him onto television, and he had refused. He was finally convinced when I asked him what he would give to see Franz Liszt play the piano. He thought about it. "Well, that I would like." "Well, Mr. Horowitz, that's how people feel about you," I explained. So he agreed, with the provision that there would be no closeups, because people might think it was someone else playing. We did the taping and I cheated and put in some closeups, and it was clear that it was not someone else playing. The program was incredible because of the energy and the visualness of the playing. It was the first time he saw how he played.

A word about the superiority of tape over film. Tape has an immediacy that film cannot duplicate. Tape has an immediate connection to the event. Film has a kind of mistiness and separation you do not want to have in a case like this.

Question and Answer Session

Bronson: I am glad you mentioned Summer and Smoke, because yesterday there were some comments regarding us big guys (e.g., The Metropolitan Opera) and what's in this for the little guys. Summer and Smoke was done by a small opera company. They have a short season in the spring, and they have thus far done three things for their local public television station, one of which has already been seen nationally. Kirk, would you tell us about that?

Browning: Summer and Smoke was part of the regular season of the Chicago Opera Theatre, and then we moved into the studio. It was an absolutely ideal project. Basically it's musical theatre, very lyric and accessible. It was beautifully cast for television, something that they knew they were going to do in advance. What's particularly interesting about this is that because we could not afford to do the orchestra track along with the performance on camera, we used a piano track. We did the whole thing in the studio from a piano track. The piano was "directed" by the conductor, put on tape, and then later the conductor using the tape of himself conducting the piano, conducted the orchestra and laid the tape in. It worked: you hear the piano a little bit from time to time, but basically, it's overridden by the orchestra.

Question: I have always felt that NBC Opera was the best ever done, and I miss it. Why can we not have that kind of opera again, now with so much opera being done?

Browning: I did the NBC Opera from 1950 to 1961. To be provocative and heretical, even if I had the money I'd never go back to that format and that style again. It had a very small, kind of cult audience. It was elitist. This country has no operatic tradition. The American people couldn't care less. We are currently building a tradition in this country for opera, and the future for broadcast opera as I see it is taped from the stage. That is how people understand it. And, going back to the original problem, it's terribly expensive to do opera in the studio.

Question: I have a question about the nitty-gritty of staffing, and it is addressed to everyone on the panel. Who is the ultimate decision maker on a taping, the director of the television production or the director of the original piece?

Jones: It depends very much on the deal and the television network. Sometimes the television company has ultimate control; it works better when there is a cooperation between the two. I think that you are in trouble when you begin to talk about who has control. It works best if you know the work is headed ultimately for television and the TV director can be made to feel part of it early on.

Generally the arts group will want to maintain artistic control, but you have to earn the right to make that demand. Once you learn the medium you have the right to demand control. Some arts groups don't know enough to make final decisions.

Wojewodski: My experience was that it works best when it is on a fully cooperative basis.

Bronson: For us the situation really varies, but cooperation has to be maintained. However, working live is very different from working in a studio or on location.

(The panel was in agreement. No other panelist wished to add comment.) -- Editor's Note.

Question: There seems to be a general consensus that dance has been successfully transferred to television. Opera as well. What about theatre? There seems to be much more confusion about theatre.

Browning: I am not sanguine about pick-ups of drama off the stage. I've never done it in such a way that I thought it was very good.

Englander: Wait a minute, your Taming of the Shrew was brilliant!

Browning: Oh, it wasn't, but I'll come back to that. The whole business of taping an average, fairly realistic play with a live audience instead of taking it into a studio is a problem. As far as I am concerned it is going to bomb every time. I did a taped in-the-theater production of Doll's House with Liv Ullman and Sam Waterston at the Vivian Beaumont. It looked like a bad studio show -- badly lit and awkwardly staged. It did not do justice to this stage production nor did it become a television production in its own right.

Now, The Taming of the Shrew, which Roger mentioned, Bill Ball insisted I do. I thought there was no way to make it work -- it was very presentational -- and then I happened to see a matinee with an audience of school children and had the idea to make it a kind of street theatre with an audience of kids. That worked.

Jones: I feel passionately that only about five percent of theatre productions are worth taping in the theater. When it is comedy that must have an audience to work, then you have a case for staying in the theater. For straight drama, don't tape on stage; take it into the studio or out on location. When you take the actor out of the theater, exciting things can happen. You have to give him a chance to re-pitch his performance, so he's not trying to hit the back wall. If you are taping something in the theater, translation is a real problem.

Question: But doesn't the actor need an audience?

Jones: No, because in the studio you have one of the most demanding of all audiences in the camera operators.

Question: For Roger Englander: How many hours of music will you program for CBS Cable; how much money do you have, and what are your criteria for choosing?

Englander: I don't really know the answers to the first two questions without my papers in front of me. On the third, CBS Cable wants to provide an alternative to the commercial television networks. What I will be doing is what interests me and my colleagues. That is musical theatre, wonderful cabaret acts, Lincoln Center Chamber Music Society, YMHA Chamber Music Orchestra, and the Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra. I don't go to orchestral concerts anymore, because they're dull. We are not planning on doing much live from the stage.

Question: Are you looking at chamber and orchestral groups throughout the country?

Englander: Yes, we are looking, but CBS's theatre people are the ones who are really travelling around actively looking at the regional theatres.

Question: What is CBS doing with opera?

Englander: We have purchased a package of opera that has not been seen here. Herbert Von Karajan conducting Carmen and Othello -- we plan to start with some six to eight operas that have not been seen here.

Question: If a work with unknown actors and an unknown playwright were good at a regional theatre, would you be interested?

Englander: Yes, if the work were good, absolutely. If the quality turns people on. You should see the list of plays that is circulating at CBS now. It's exciting. Make sure CBS Cable knows what you're doing.

Question: Most of the conversation so far has been about live tapings. If you have a chance to transfer, translate, what is the labor cost like for a particular theatre?

Englander: Figure twice the weekly salary for everyone involved for a "normal" staging, for AFTRA and IA stagehands.

Question: Roger, you said, "Live is dead." Would you comment?

Englander: When I said "Live is dead" I said it to get you to think about it. The live institutions will remain, they'll have to remain, there will be less of them. Some are museums exhibiting the dinosaurs of the past and some are doing new work, but there will be consolidation and specialization among the many orchestras now existing. We are all going to be living underground one day with screens around us. We will get our information from screens. We won't go to work because of the cost and scarcity of energy. We'll all live in little underground cells in the not too distant future.

Question: Has anyone explored how to adapt theaters physically to the lighting and other technical requirements?

Browning: Technology improves every year now. We are doing things in live tapings now that we never dreamed of doing several years ago. It's probably coming to the point where it may be worthwhile to consider adapting a theater to accommodate cameras, but you could spend a lot of money altering your theater now only to find out in a couple of years that it was not adequate because the technology advances so rapidly.

Question: With all the technological developments, what is happening to television sets?

Browning: You've struck a note that really interests me more than anything else. The barrier is not so much a technological barrier as a kind of psychic barrier. The key to television today is that it essentially has no authority. The viewer has more authority than the medium itself. There is nothing inexorable about it. You can look at it, turn away from it, turn it off, turn to another channel. The psychology of the medium is so diabolical, and it is so hard to get anybody to care about what's on television. That is really the key to the whole state of the business today -- that no one today comes to a television program predisposed to respond to it; they've got to be sold moment to moment, and at any moment they feel they can just turn it off or just turn away from it. I don't know what the answer to it is. The thing that I feel most frustrated by is the business of trying to do something that people are going to care about. The answer is, I suppose, that if the technology had developed another way, and each house had a special room for the television with a big screen and you went in and it was your temple. Television hasn't even got a space of its own. It doesn't exist in any performance space. It has no aura at all. I don't know; you tell me what to do about it.

In the fifties it wasn't the same way. People turned on the television and they were committed to it. People sat down to watch whole programs.

Question: I would like to address this question to the entire panel. What are the most important things that television and arts people should be aware of during the transition from the art form to television?

Englander: Going back to what I said before, we are talking about communication arts. Remember the words -- how do you want to get the story across to the widest audience in the very best way.

Jones: What interests me is what is the quality of my crew on a show. A major problem here in the U.S. is getting people who know the technology. The BBC has four crews that do nothing but drama year round, and they are really terrific, because that's all they do all the time. And they eat directors for breakfast, because they know better than the directors. On the technological side, are there people in this country who know what is required? There's no mystery about it, you just have to start spending time to learn what it's all about; begin to get yourself into situations so you can begin to feel at home.

Wojewodski: It's very important to be involved with someone who has real sympathy for the work at its point of origin. If you have a camera director who does not love the opera, you may have an unhappy experience.

Milano: When we began, we decided we would not disturb the performers at all -- that they would not even be aware of the cameras. Now we are involving performers more and more. We'll tell the people they are going to be on a particular camera, so they know what camera to play to, and they are learning to trust the camera. For instance, Renata Scotto when she saw the playback of herself, immediately decided that she was going to have to look different. She lost a great deal of weight and she looks tremendously better now. She has learned to control and scale her gestures so they will read well on the camera. So they do not look overblown. The more we work in this area the better we all get at it.

Browning: I've done lots of collaboration and find that one of the problems today with young directors is that it is difficult to get them to understand what it is to serve a project. They tend to want to arrogate themselves all sorts of prerogatives that are not theirs. It's very difficult for a director who is talented and with lots of ideas to keep from trying to take over.

Bronson: There are always things that you wish you could know of in advance. For example, do you want the white dress in the first act to be white for the live audience, television white, or an entirely different color? All these kinds of things have to be planned in advance.

Question: CBS is talking about doing musical theatre. Is it economically feasible to put something only on cable, or perhaps to put on cable first and give it a live run afterwards?

Englander: Yes, I am thinking of doing this kind of thing -- picking up some pieces that have been written but not mounted yet. Why not see them on television first and let them have a life on the stage later? It also makes sense to mount something solely for television. We are mounting a special performance of Four Saints in Three Acts.

Question: Is there any exploratory, experimental work being done on arts cable? Is there anything being done to establish what a television aesthetic would be?

Jones: It's a question of how large a platform you have available. BBC has an enormous amount of that kind of possibility, but even there it isn't done. You have to be a director of real stature and success to be funded to do such work, and even then the odds of actually pulling it off are probably around 50-50. In a play-safe world, you don't get your fingers burned.

Wojewodski: I think this may belong in the hands of the new kind of director who may be found among the video artists who are doing the most interesting kind of experiments now. But I don't think that the people who now control money are interested in this kind of experiment.

Question: Does CBS have any plans for illustrated music -- Fantasia type work?

Englander: We're talking about it all the time; if you have some new ideas, let me know; we've been looking for this.

Question: Kirk, would you tell us about your taping of Macbeth with Sarah Caldwell?

Browning: Oh boy. Now look. I tried my best to persuade Richmond not to do that. The experience was both painful and unhappy. The pain came from the restrictions, including money. My big problem was the cast -- they were paranoid about being thrown in front of the camera doing a production that had not been that well received. If there was any measure of success I achieved in doing that Macbeth in two days, it was in going to the cast and persuading them I could save them. I managed to do that in a way that was a totally happy experience. I took all the pressure away from them. Richmond's original idea was to do a pick-up with an audience and just "get it." I persuaded him that that would be unfair to me and to the cast. So we had an audience that was made up of friends and supporters. We did it under the most relaxed conditions. We let the actors work at their own pace. If they became uncomfortable, we let them stop and we did another pick-up. What that did was enable the cast to bring what it was trying to do into focus in a way that was interesting. There is some merit in the final result.

Bronson: An observation grows from this on the issue of control. The one who is affected by a flop or failure is the artistic institution, so when you think about what you are going to do in television, and it is something that looks good on paper, remember that. We should not be afraid to take risks, but be aware that there are risks.

Question: What is the current production budget for Live From the Met? If it were larger, what would you do differently? After direct costs, how much, if anything, goes back to the Met?

Bronson: I can only give you averages because each production is different. In our budget for the next year the average cost is roughly $400,000 to get on the air including the cost of transmission for the radio simulcast. Above the line costs range from $120,000 to $150,000. This includes fees to company, stage hands, and other technical personnel. We don't make any money; we cover our administrative costs. We do, however, own it totally, so whatever other opportunities exist for those properties come back to us. We have netted $100,000 to $200,000 each of the last two years on that.

From Rights to Residuals

Chair:
Arthur Whitelaw
  Director of Theatre Development, HBO

Panelists:
Bret Adams
  Bret Adams, Ltd., Literary-theatrical agent
Jay Broad
  Playwright
Maurice Levine
  Independent Producer
Stuart Rekant
  Vice President of Business Affairs, HBO
M. Edgar Rosenblum
  Executive Director, Long Wharf Theatre, New Haven, Connecticut

Statement by Stuart Rekant

I want to talk about four aspects of cable television production: development, financing, production, and distribution.

Development: To develop a property, you must be able to obtain the rights. Are you dealing with all the owners and do they own all the necessary rights? One of the more interesting problems with theatre is that live stage rights are often controlled separately from the right to televise and fix: a television or motion picture company typically owns the television rights to the property, and the original author retains the live stage and telecast rights. This may present problems, since in negotiations, you want to be able to assure that there is only one version of the property around.

If you are working with public domain material, be sure that it in fact is in the public domain. It is possible for a property to be in the public domain in this country and not in Canada or elsewhere. When you go to raise Canadian money you are in trouble if you have to pay additional money to someone for the right to show your program in Canada, if those rights are granted at all.

As to how much to pay for rights, who knows? There are no real precedents. But you can check the fields in which rights are sold today: network and syndicated television as well as live theatre. The selling of rights is not new; it's cable television that is new. What's different in cable is that the budgets are lower, yet people expect more, so in negotiations people are often very far apart.

Casting is also part of development. You have to know what the whole package is going to look like. You need to know the who, what, when, where and how much it will cost to make it look this way. Once you have put the package together, if you are an independent producer, you will want to option it.

Financing: How do you pay for it? Don't spec it on borrowed money from the family and expect to make a killing. If you don't have a distribution outlet up front, you may end up with an expensive archival piece. There is also much to be said for the early creative involvement of the network or disc and cassette people. If they are involved at the beginning, they do make a contribution, and it helps to develop a consensus for getting the product on the air. If you develop a property by yourself, your product may be unsuitable for the market you have in mind.

Most producers in our field are nearly fully financed by networks. In the case of musicals -- which are more expensive -- we are seeing co-productions with Canadian sources because of tax shelters there. There are also productions with the BBC and other companies. Non-theatrical and video disc and cassette companies are becoming involved as well.

In summary, try to find the money from one source first. If your source does not provide sufficient financing, then put together rights that were not committed as part of the primary financing arrangement, e.g., syndication, foreign television, disc and cassette rights.

Production: The cost factor in the Equity to AFTRA transfer is becoming a problem. You need Equity approval -- which is tied to what they will charge -- to do a television version of a legitimate stage production. The charge, in some cases, is a week's salary for a day's rehearsal or shooting. Sometimes it's less if you can work out a rate. It's a growing problem, especially on musicals where the costs are so high.

A number of problems may arise in budgeting. Lighting is often underestimated in terms of both cost and need. Often the number of rehearsal days needed is underestimated. People sometimes do not allow for the time required to re-block and rehearse for a taping. A show may work well on stage, but may be too long for television. Always secure an agreement with the author that the show can be cut to a desired length for television. If the show is cut, bridging techniques may be required, and they will cost additional money, so make budgetary allowances for this as well as the cutting itself. If the show is being taped with an audience, who gets the gate? Is there a gate, or is it an invited audience? What kind of look do you want your audience to have? The question of ultimate control of a production may cause a problem for directors and playwrights who are used to having control over their productions. HBO, for example, will retain final control over its productions in order to get the look that it wants. All of these issues need to be considered in your production plans.

Distribution: What are the various distribution avenues? The primary one is pay cable; we do not yet have enough experience with basic cable. The length of the exhibition window and the number of days is subject to negotiation on each individual project, but there are certain "givens" regarding pay television's use of product. It can range from 12 exhibition days up to 100. A network looks for flexibility, and the more the program costs, the more flexibility is necessary to justify the expenditure.

Depending on your source of financing, if you are the producer you will want to control the back end, standard television, domestic and foreign, disc and cassette, non-theatrical, and theatrical rights. "Standard TV" here means non-pay television as we know it. If you have held back some rights and sold others elsewhere, you'll find that you need a pay window of at least a couple of years -- more if you have a theatre piece because the network needs time to locate the theatrical audience. Then you can make the foreign sale. Cassette/disc sales (where you are dealing with the sale of the product to the actual consumer) may be held back for the whole exhibition period or at least a couple of years, so that pay television has a chance to exploit the piece independently of any competition.

Residuals are not really the problem that everyone thinks they are. SAG and AFTRA have reached an agreement with the major studios and independent producers allowing for payment after the earlier of ten exhibition days or one year on pay television. The residual obligation is typically that of the producer, especially where he holds any of the continuing rights. Residuals, payable in other markets, such as standard television, come under standard historical network union agreements which provide for a percentage of dollars to actors or for fixed fees.

In summary, it seems to me that from the point of view of the pay TV networks, the viability of projects from other media like theatre is unproven. So, cost has to be held down, because expectations of performance are still so uncertain. We have no data on which to base expenditures. Everyone should be aware of this marketplace atmosphere. HBO will, with luck, play one theatre event a month next year. So if you add up the slots available from all these services during what will probably be a shake-out period, you can't get too excited too quickly. At this point, it is not clear whether there are any markets excited about anything other than movies. Pay television still consists of movies. Consequently, we can't predict now whether pay television will provide arts people and institutions with any real income in the future.

Statement by Jay Broad

I have four observations I would like to touch on regarding theatre, myself, and cable. First, we are obviously on the brink of something big here. At the same time, we seem to have been told by everyone but the man from CBS this morning that budgets are limited and that cable companies are in business to make money. We need to think about this. I love money as much as the next person, but remember that before you jump in you should understand what "limited funds" means when you have to confront it.

A second area I wish to raise is pornography. This issue has been skirted so far at this conference. A person's view on pornography is something to be clear on personally. I am not making a moral judgment when I say that it may not be wise to form an alliance with a group whose intent is to produce or to show pornography. Cable as an industry should probably make a statement on this issue somewhere along the line.

I was surprised and a little disappointed to hear that a number of the arts networks are looking for advertiser support as opposed to being pay channels. We know that paid ads have created the television we have today. The feeling of excitement of cable was probably created by pay cable. For example, we heard talk about the possibility of six to 20-minute programs.

The fourth observation I have is really a question: Who controls whatever project you may be putting on cable? If you are running a theatre, you have a strong fiduciary trust from your community along with a strong ideological trust. To what extent should you structure your plans around cable? If we are really on the brink of something big, it behooves us to know where we stand now, so we will not find ourselves running to catch up 10 years from now.

Two Plays Transferred: Lessons Learned: We have heard today that only two or three people seem to know what is a desirable process of translation from stage to screen, and perhaps it should not even be done. I have had two plays transferred, one in a studio and one from the stage. Neither was adapted by script to the needs of a new medium.

An independent producer liked my play, Conflict of Interest, and sold the idea to Showtime. Barnard Hughes was cast in the lead and Jose Ferrer directed it for the stage. It was shot for Showtime without a DGA director. The producer rented a theatre, rehearsed for 4 weeks, ran for two weeks, and during the third week of the run taped two days of the play with an audience present.

The crew was, I think, not clear about what they were doing. Later, when I watched the tape alone, I decided two things were wrong with it: the writing and the direction. It was written for the stage and was being played for the stage. I probably should have said "no" to its going on television in the first place, but that gets back to money. Because I had it in a drawer, saying "yes" made eating easier for the next six months.

The other project, a musical, was shot in a studio in a week with a limited budget. During that project, I found out how people who are not in control get such reputations for being insane, crazy, and also very silly.

I was in the booth as the time was getting tighter and tighter, when the director said, "We have to shoot that shot over," and the producer said, "No, we'll just have to go with it. We don't have time." This had happened 10 or 12 times that day, so I said, "No, listen, if we can't do the thing right, let's just stop the production. Everyone just stop!" And, because someone in the booth had said "stop," everyone backed away from the controls. The producer said, quite rightfully, "This man does not have the

right to stop this production." And she was absolutely right, so everyone went back to the controls. I finally thought to myself, the only way I can stop this is by throwing myself across the monitors, so they won't be able to see to continue. And at that point, I said to myself, "that's insane!" so I left, and they went on. This is not critical of them, as it all turned out pretty well, but just to say you must understand clearly who is in control. If you cannot retain control, don't invest your soul in the project.

Statement by M. Edgar Rosenblum

I'm going to go round and about on rights and residuals, partly because for the last few days, I've been feeling apprehensive and questioning about what we are doing here.

Working and Negotiating with the Cable Industry: Our audience at this conference is composed almost exclusively of people representing nonprofit institutions, and here on the panels, the representatives have been mostly from commercial, for-profit companies. There are differences between them and us: of economics, of approach, of feelings about money, and finally there is a spiritual difference. Until the spiritual difference is recognized, there will be difficulty negotiating both the art and the commerciality. There are conflicts, but not the kind we can't overcome. We have to understand our differences. We wouldn't be here if we weren't interested in making the transition.

Opera and theatre do not remain opera and theatre when they are transferred; they become television. We must accept that before we even get to the point of negotiating what our rights are going to be, what we are going to sell, and what we are going to ask for. The transfer of our work to cable is not our primary purpose. If we want to transfer our work, we must be able to do it without feeling that it impinges on our primary purpose. I sense that many of you here feel that what you're hearing is impinging on your artistic purpose.

My television experience has been primarily with Public TV where we have not been happy with negotiations for various reasons. But, visibility was the purpose, and it helped visibility. Visibility brought us increased national recognition, and that surely helped bring in grant money which comprises 40 percent of our income, so our gain was not insignificant.

In negotiations, you have to recognize that the cable companies are in it for the money. They function on 100 percent earned income. We do not earn all our money, and we both have to negotiate knowing that. You hold your institution in trust from the public and have to negotiate something fair in return.

We've been hearing about "stars" all weekend, but that is no different from our situation as regional theatres vis a vis Broadway. There are definite differences between the two, but they haven't caused an isolation of the two. Our regional theatre has fed Broadway and has fed the entertainment form. Meanwhile, there are more people being exposed to arts in these beer-

drinking households that cable demographics tell us about, and that will give us all more depth of perception and support. We deal with a tiny minority of the population, and whenever we can increase our visibility, it helps us.

The Function of "No" in a Negotiation: There is a great potential for video discs as educational tools. There are tens of thousands of schools which could use video versions of our art forms for educational purposes. I must tell you a story about that. When we did a Eugene O'Neill piece with PBS a number of years ago, I was approached by someone who wanted to buy the "educational" rights. He said he had gotten clearance from PBS and also from the O'Neill estate for those rights, and would I give my permission. I said surely he could have my permission. What could he offer? There was no answer. Eventually, there came a one-page contract in the mail which virtually said I would give him my life in perpetuity. I said I was all in favor of educating the world by and about Eugene O'Neill, but what was he going to give me? "Well, we'll give you some specific percentages of dollars." I asked about various usages that might happen and he said, "Oh, I don't think that will ever happen." I told PBS and the O'Neill estate I was going to say no, that I wanted contractual assurance that if he sold to not just one school in one state, but 50,000 schools in 50 states, Australia, New Zealand, and England, we would participate in those percentages. The institutional point of view is that we want the protection. It is important to be able to say no in a negotiation.

Artistic Control: Finally, we have to realize that with regard to artistic control, the cable industry and the performing arts understand that it's a dictatorial process governed by a democratic process as well. At the same time, we have a preciousness about our process that has to be protected and it is difficult to measure this in the end. Both sides must recognize that we have a qualitative process that must be fulfilled, and it is very difficult to match it against a monetary objective.

Statement by Bret Adams

We represent authors, actors, and directors. I include that information because a lot of our experience spans all three categories. Today, no one is sure that what is being asked for in a negotiation is the right amount. When I first started as an agent, I had to learn what to ask and when to ask, and that is where we stand today with cable. There aren't many literary theatrical agents who have more than a few instances to refer to.

Mistakes to Avoid Through Negotiation: Most of our experience has been with the transfer of stage properties directly to television. The most harmful and disappointing thing about these transfers has been the decision to tape in performance. For example, Camille at the Guthrie was taped during a performance. I saw it live, on stage, and it was a truly lovely, delicate show. The outfit that produced it for TV didn't allow enough time to do it properly, so you have this lovely, delicate production which you cannot see, because the lighting was not right. The lighting was not re-done, so the color is all wrong. The production appears purple, deep blue, almost black.

When negotiating, I suggest you negotiate taping without an audience, or if there is to be an audience, then there must be a contractual stipulation that lighting for television be used during the performance. This will ultimately help your organization's reputation.

Another thing that comes up in negotiation is the word, "perpetuity." "Perpetuity" is a very scary word, because a property sold this way is greatly restricted. The best cable deal you can make is to get in and get out within three to five years. Then your deal doesn't discount or disallow eventual sale to motion pictures. Indeed, cable may eventually showcase materials for film. One of the attractive things about Conflict of Interest was that it was shot as a play. Since there is film interest, the cable production may serve as a showcase for us to move to film. To put it on film now would mean opening it up to location filming.

If you are contemplating doing something for cable, take an option before you buy, and get as knowledgeable a lawyer as you can to work out the contract. It is essential that the definitions be clear about profits and percentages.

Our whole negotiation situation is a bad one now, because we really don't know what to ask for for performing talent. We're not quite sure where we stand.

Statement by Maurice Levine

I'll deal with rights with regard to music only. First, two pieces of background: Although I am listed in the program as an independent producer, I also work with Sonny Fox and Richard Seader, a theatrical producer. Each one of us has an independent company, and we are also involved in a joint venture. Secondly, I recommend the book This Business of Music as a very useful book which even contains actual contract forms. It's available at the Drama Book Shop.

Know Your Adversary When Negotiating: I want to give you a three minute crash course on the workings of the business of music. It's a strange kind of business, with a series of interlocking relationships in which people are usually pretty friendly, but everyone has an alphabetical fortress.

It all starts with the creator, composer. He or she owns the property and gets a copyright on it. That copyright is as real as an apartment house. Just as you cannot move into someone's apartment house, you cannot do anything with copyrighted material without permission. The composer has the AGAC, the American Guild of Authors and Composers. In order to do anything with your copyrighted music, you must have a publisher. That is the first adversary relationship -- the one between the composer, lyricist and the publisher. The publisher has MPPA, the Music Publishers Protective Association to back it up. Finally, the music publisher today has to have a relationship with a recording company, if the music is to get real exposure. The recording companies have the RIAA, the Recording Industry Association of America. Now the "common enemy" of all these is the broadcast industry.

I use that term in quotation marks. The broadcasting industry, radio, television and cable is a grey area now. You have to know who is your business adversary when dealing with music rights.

Perhaps I can best be of help by giving you some of my own experience. Along the way, a friend of mine and I set up two music publishing companies: one in ASCAP and one in BMI, both of which are licensing organizations to collect fees for the playing of music on air or in publishing. ASCAP and BMI deal in small rights as opposed to grand rights.

Small Rights and Grand Rights: I want to talk a little about grand rights and small rights. "Small" is deceiving, because very often, historically, the small right is much more valuable than the grand right. A grand right must be secured when using a series of songs which are part of a whole dramatic work like South Pacific. You cannot take the score away from the book, it's one total package, and the producer gets certain rights and privileges. You cannot put these elements together and call it small rights. The question is when does a small right (an isolated song) stop being small and turn into a grand right? A group out on the coast put on an all Gershwin night using songs from the corpus of Gershwin. This was a grand right and needs permission. This one went to court and will set a precedent. In producing, you must know whether you are dealing with grand or small rights.

Two final things to mention: The theme of yesterday's session was that the best playwright is a dead playwright. Let me remind you that dead playwrights have heirs, and even though they may run delicatessens, they have lawyers. Finally, try to use musical properties that have never been associated with a movie. Movie companies don't like to let go for less than very big money.

Summary by Arthur Whitelaw

The main thing is to know what rights you actually hold. I listen to people everyday trying to sell me properties they do not have the rights to, but they aren't aware that they don't have the rights. The difficulty is, there are no standards for rights in cable yet, as the Dramatists Guild contract is standard for theatre. The Writers Guild contract is used in television and is being re-negotiated for use in cable and use in the motion picture business. Out of all of this will probably come a standard. No one can tell you what to do now. We're in the process of negotiating what rights will be; it's coming about in a rather orderly way and will probably be formalized in the next five years.

Question and Answer Session

Question: On the relationship between small rights and grand rights: who deals with which? Does BMI do one and ASCAP the other?

Levine: ASCAP and BMI deal only in small rights and only in the licensing of small rights.

Question: I know how much it costs me to stage my product; is there a way I can find out how much it will cost the cable company and how much I might make on a deal?

Rekant: At the moment, all you can do is see what the market will bear. There's no practice yet to guide you through negotiation. Know who you are dealing with. If it is an independent producer, make sure there is enough money for the production and that it is going to be spent on the right things. The disc industry has just started; the cassette market is just a year old, and we're just beginning to see the figures on what these markets will bring. The best you can probably do at this point is to go for a percentage of the ancillary rights.

Question: I understand that HBO will be doing productions of plays whose movie rights have already been sold. What is the benefit to the movie company other than money?

Rekant: We have been in discussions with owners of movie rights to some properties. I don't think there have been any announcements of this yet, none has progressed to that point. They want distribution. Traditionally, since the 50's, there has been no market for "legitimate theatre" television productions. Movie companies now see a potential market for properties they have on the shelf and a way to create product for their disc and cassette business. We are, I hope, moving towards three distinct products: (1) a legitimate stage presentation, (2) a standard movie production, and (3) a legitimate stage version for pay television.

Question: In cable, what is the author's position regarding artistic control? It's not like movies where authors write for hire. Where does the author stand in this field?

Adams: The only position we have experienced has been like the Writers' Guild where the author had no control. Generally speaking, the author does not retain much control.

Question: If you have to negotiate for "in perpetuity" as opposed to a limited run, what should you be alert to?

Rekant: If you end up negotiating for perpetuity on a property, ask "when can I do it with a new cast?" There is a question as to when you can remake it.

Question: How do you assure that we actually have the rights to the materials we try to sell to you?

Rekant: I can't answer that generally. If you are a new producer, and we were going to work together, we'd probably hold your hand.

Michael Miller: I'm going to invoke the producer's one privilege, which is to close the show. I have found this to be an informative and stimulating weekend. I trust that has been true for you as well. We will prepare a full report of this conference and share it with you and with friends and colleagues in the field. Thank you all.

Appendix I: Conference Agenda

Dates: June 5, 6, 7; Place: New York University, Washington Square

Friday - June 5

Bobst Library, Washington Square South

12-2	Registration and luncheon Keynote Address: Les Brown, Editor-in-Chief, Channels of Communication
	Conference moves to Tisch Hall, 40 West 4th Street
2:15-3:30	Panel 1: Industry Structure and Analysis Chair:Lawrence B. Hilford: Management Consultant, Supervising Supervising Rainbow Programming Services Panel: John Gault: President, Manhattan Cable TV Vivian Horner: Vice President, Program Development, Warner-Amex Cable Communications, Inc.
3:45-5	Panel II: Market Analysis Chair: Charlotte Schiff Jones: Vice President for Marketing, CBS Cable Panel: Robert H. Alter: President, Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau Larry Howe: Vice-President, Corporate Development, American Television and Communications Corporation
5-6	Open floor for questions

Saturday - June 6

Tisch Hall, 40 West 4th Street

9-12	Panel III: The New Channels Chair: Lou Moore, President, ELM Video Theatre Panel: Jack Healy: Vice President, Product Development and Acquisition for ABC Video Enterprises Lewis L. Lloyd: The Entertainment Channel, A Service of RCTV Marc Lustgarten: President, Bravo Fern McBride: Director of Program Development, East Coast Showtime Entertainment Suzanne Weil: Director, PTV-1 (PBS) Arthur Whitelaw: Director of Theatre Development, HBO Jack Willis: Vice President, Programming and Development, CBS Cable
12-2	Lunch Break (A list of local restaurants will be provided)
2-5	Panel IV: The Producer's View Chair: Chloe Aaron: President, Chloe Aaron Associates Panel: Michael Bronson: Media Department Director, Metropolitan Opera; Executive Producer, Live from the Met John Goberman: Director of Media Development for Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc. Jim Mervis: Vice President of Programming, CBS Video Enterprises Bob Rubin: Vice President, Programming for Cable, Group W Cable Productions Bill Siegler: Independent Producer, Packager, President, Siegler Productions
5-6	Summary Discussion Chair: J. Michael Miller Lou Moore, Chloe Aaron Open floor to questions
6:30-8	Cocktails -- Deutsches Haus: 42 Washington Mews

Sunday - June 7

Tisch Hall, 40 West 4th Street

9-12 Panel V: State of the Art
Chair: Michael Bronson
Panel: Kirk Browning: Freelance Director
Roger Englander: Senior Producer of Music, CBS Cable
David Jones: Artistic Director, BAM Theatre Company, Brooklyn, New York
Fabrizio Milano: Stage Director, Metropolitan Opera
Stan Wojewodski: Artistic Director, Center Stage, Baltimore

12:15-1:15 Brunch (Sandwiches, coffee, white wine on the patio)

1:15-4 Panel VI: From Rights to Residuals
Chair: Arthur Whitelaw
Panel: Bret Adams: Bret Adams Ltd., Literary-Theatrical Agent
Jay Broad: Playwright
Maurice Levine: Independent Producer
Stuart Rekant: Vice President of Business Affairs, HBO
M. Edgar Rosenblum: Executive Director, Long Wharf Theatre, New Haven, Connecticut

4-4:30 Summary Discussion
Chair: J. Michael Miller
Michael Bronson, Arthur Whitelaw

Open floor to questions

Appendix II: Panelists' Biographies

CHLOE AARON is President of Chloe Aaron Associates, a company she formed to do television consulting and production work for performing arts centers such as the Kennedy Center. The company will also develop television productions of dramatic materials, performances, and documentaries. In December of 1980, Ms. Aaron left PBS to become president of Washington D.C.-based Television Corporation of America (TCA), and since that time has moved to New York and founded her own company.

From 1976 until she left PBS, Ms. Aaron held the post of Senior Vice President for Programming, the highest ranking executive position filled by a woman at any network.

At PBS, Ms. Aaron was in charge of prime-time programming including news and public affairs, science, dance, drama, and music, with a national schedule valued at approximately $100 million a year. Over the past year the prime-time audience at PBS has grown fifty percent over the previous year and viewer contributions to local Public Television stations increased thirteen percent. Ms. Aaron originated PBS's "common carriage" concept, in which the majority of Public Television stations carry the same programs on the same night, to enhance promotional and advertising efforts. She is now developing a 25-week drama series combining the best of original American production, dramatic writing, and performance with programs from abroad, to premiere on PBS in the fall of 1981.

As Director of the National Endowment for the Arts' Public Media Program from 1970 to 1976, she was responsible for all Endowment activities related to the funding of film, TV and radio. Here, she became involved with Public Television including the funding of major series such as "Dance in America," "Vision," "Live from Lincoln Center," and the Academy Award-winning "Bolero" and "Harlan County, U.S.A."

As a free-lance journalist in the 1960's, she concentrated her efforts on television and the communications industry in general, with articles appearing in The Washington Post, Arts in America, and New York Magazine.

Ms. Aaron is a member of the Trustee Committee on Film for the Museum of Modern Art; National Advisory Board, Center for the Book, Library of Congress; The Whitney Museum of American Art, Film and Video Committee; the Board of International Writers' Service; a member of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences; International Institute of Communications, Ltd.; American Women in Radio and Television; and, International Radio and Television Society. She holds a B.A. from Occidental College and an M.A. from George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

BRET ADAMS has been an agent in New York for the last twenty-five years. He has full service offices in New York and on the Coast which represent actors, writers, composers, designers and directors.

ROBERT H. ALTER is the President of the Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau, the national trade association of the cable communications industry. He is responsible for directing the CAB toward its main objective: establish the viability of cable television as a major advertising medium for national and local advertisers, and to build a central source of sales development information for systems operators, networks and reps.

For over twenty years he was Executive Vice President of the Radio Advertising Bureau, where he was responsible for marketing, national sales activities, and membership development. Recognized as an innovator in the field of broadcast management and sales training, he has designed meeting functions to bring the broadcaster and advertiser together.

He is a sought-after speaker in the field of management, media communications and research, and has appeared throughout the English speaking world and Mexico. He is a graduate of the University of Iowa.

JAY BROAD wrote Conflict of Interest, which toured starring Barry Nelson and Walter Abels. Winner of the Straw Hat Award, it was produced in regional theatres. It was taped for cable TV, with Barnard Hughes as the lead and Jose Ferrer as the director. Another play, Killdeer, with Ralph Waite and Barbara Barrie, was produced by Joseph Papp at the Public Theatre. He is the former Artistic Director of the PAF Playhouse in Huntington, Long Island. He also directed and created the play for Broadway, Red, White & Maddox, which toured the summer and was televised.

MICHAEL BRONSON is the Media Department Director of the Metropolitan Opera and the Executive Producer of the "Live From the Met" television series. He also serves as Vice President of Opera America and is a member of the Opera Musical Theatre Panel of the National Endowment for the Arts.

After working as a technician and stage manager at the Green Mansions Hotel Summer Stock Theatre for twelve years, and doing some performing and production work on off-Broadway, Mr. Bronson joined the Metropolitan Opera Studio in 1961 as an Assistant Stage Manager. An Assistant Technical Administrator in the Technical and Business Administration Department of the Metropolitan Opera from 1963 to 1972, he then became Business and Technical Administrator, then Business Director in 1978, a position he held until his appointment as Media Department Director in 1981.

Currently, Mr. Bronson is responsible for the planning and production of the "Live from the Met" telecasts, including negotiations for sponsorship, network scheduling, foreign sales, intermission contact, and coordination with the artistic and technical departments of the opera house. The Media Department is also responsible for all aspects of the Texaco-Metropolitan Opera Saturday afternoon broadcasts. Mr. Bronson is responsible for the Metropolitan's exploration into all areas of possible exploitation of the Met's TV and radio product: Pay-TV, videodisc, and video cassette. In addition to his responsibilities as Media Department Director, Mr. Bronson is involved in the labor contract negotiations with all of the Unions having jurisdiction within the opera house or with the opera company's activities.

He holds a degree in English and Drama from C.C.N.Y.

LES BROWN, Editor-in-Chief of CHANNELS of Communications, has covered the broadcast media as a journalist since 1953. He was television-radio editor of Variety, and television correspondent for The New York Times for seven years. Author of four books: Television: The Business Behind the Box (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), which depicts a year in the television industry; Electric Media (Harcourt, 1973), a high school primer on the workings of American broadcasting; The New York Times Encyclopedia of Television (Times Books, 1977); and Keeping Your Eye on Television (Pilgrim Press, 1979), a new work that discusses the public's rights in television and radio.

A Presidential Fellow of the Aspen Institute, he received the 1979 Louis Cowan Award in Communications from the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies for his contributions to the public's understanding of media issues. In 1977 he was named a Poynter Fellow in Modern Journalism by Yale University and also received a special award for reporting from the National Association of Television Program Executives. He is also a member of the editorial board of the Television Quarterly.

He founded a folk music cabaret, The Gate of Horn, and wrote the lyrics to "Abilene," a popular hit in the 1960's.

Born in Indiana Harbor, Indiana in 1928, raised in Chicago, Mr. Brown holds a B.A. in English from Roosevelt University in Chicago.

KIRK BROWNING has directed for film and television for many years. His long list of credits include MET Opera, NBC Opera, and the Bell Telephone Hour for NBC. On "Live from Lincoln Center" alone he has done the New York Philharmonic New York City Opera, Don Carlos and others ("Live from the Met"), and Verdi's Requiem. His specials include the Beverly Sills Farewell Gala, Handel's Messiah last December, and the Beverly Sills-James Levine concert with the New York Philharmonic. Most recently he directed Big Blonde with Sally Kellerman, for Great Performances.

ROGER ENGLANDER, Senior Producer of Music for CBS Cable and a five-time Emmy Award winner, has spent thirty-one of his thirty-five years in television at CBS, and was producer of the nation's top music television programs: the New York Philharmonic Young People's Concerts, with Leonard Bernstein, and Michael Tilson Thomas; Vladimir Horowitz at Carnegie Hall; S. Hurok Presents; The Bell Telephone Hour; Omnibus; the NBC Opera; 60 Minutes; The Great American Dream Machine; Live From Wolftrap; The Performing Arts; and Camera Three. He has also directed television in Italy, England, Israel, Mexico and Japan. He has staged operas for the New York City Opera Company and the Little Orchestra Society of New York. At Lincoln Center he inaugurated the New York Philharmonic Promenades with Andre Kostelanetz; co-founded the American Dance Theatre with Jose Limon; and launched the Composer Evenings with Richard Rodgers. A consultant to New York University's School of the Arts, he teaches at Fairfield University of Connecticut and was recently honored by his own Alma Mater when he was awarded the Professional Achievement Award from the University of Chicago. His other awards include the Peabody Award; the Directors Guild of America Award; the Prix Jeunesse from Munich; and the Prague International Festival Award.

JOHN GAULT has been with the cable industry since 1960 and has served as an operations manager, systems manager, regional manager, vice president of operations, executive vice president and president of three companies prior to joining American Television and Communications Corporation.

He was a director of the New York State Cable Television Association, and served as Chairman of the National Cable Television Association's Utility Relations Committee and NCTA's Ethics Committee.

He has served on industry panels and committees and has been a guest lecturer at colleges and seminars. He is the recipient of several industry awards for the development of public access programming for the communities with which he was been involved. He has also received awards for other telecommunications services developed for ATC's systems throughout the country, including the introduction of ATC's "Polycom," interactive telecommunications system in 1972.

In January, 1980, he was elected President of Manhattan Cable Television in New York City.

JOHN GOBERMAN is the Director of Media Development for the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. Originally a cellist, performing with major opera and ballet orchestras, and The American String Trio and at the Marlboro Festival, he was Administrative Coordinator at New York City Opera from 1970 to 1972. Here he was in company management and union negotiations, and proposed and produced the first live cable television broadcast of a performing arts event -- New York City Opera's Le Coq D'or (TelePrompter, November 9, 1971). At Lincoln Center, he initiated the Media Development Department, to increase revenues through a nationwide TV audience. Here he directed the development of technology for televising live performances under performance conditions, without the disturbance of performers or audience.

As producer of the Simulcasts of more than twenty-five productions on PBS, he has dealt with technical complexities as well as negotiating with constituent companies, artists, and unions concerning compensation and rights.

As consultant to KCET, Los Angeles, he produced Opera from the San Francisco Opera, Concerts by Guilini, and "Charles Aznavour and Jane Oliver." He is winner of the 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979 National Emmy Awards, the 1977 Peabody Award, and the First Television Critics' Circle Award for Achievement in Music (1976). His B.A. from Columbia is in Russian Language and Literature.

JOHN T. HEALY. Named Vice President, Product Development and Acquisitions, ABC Video Enterprises, Inc., in November, 1979, Mr. Healy reports to Herbert A. Granath, Vice President in Charge of ABC Video Enterprises, Inc. Mr. Healy has been Vice President, Corporate Planning, American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., since February, 1976.

Joining ABC in August, 1970 as Associate Director of Corporate Planning, he became Director of Planning and Development in June, 1972. In March, 1974, he was named Vice President, Planning and Administration for ABC Leisure, where he was involved in the company's diverse activities in recorded music and publishing.

Prior to joining ABC, Mr. Healy was associated with Lehigh Valley Industries and the General Foods Corporation. He holds both B.A. and Graduate degrees from Brooklyn College, where he taught Economics.

LAWRENCE B. HILFORD is a management consultant specializing in new media, currently devoting much of his time to the supervision of Rainbow Programming Services. He was formerly Senior Vice President of Columbia Pictures Industries. Prior to joining Columbia he had been Executive Vice President and a director of Viacom International, Inc., where he was responsible for all operating functions, and President of Viacom Enterprises Division, Inc. Before his association with Viacom, Mr. Hilford held executive positions with Cartridge Rental Network, Columbia Pictures Industries, Screen Gems International and Columbia Pictures, Cassette Division. A native of New York, he was graduated from Yale University and Harvard Business School.

VIVIAN M. HORNER, Ph.D. is Vice President of Program Development for Warner Amex Cable Communications, Inc. Dr. Horner, who joined Warner in 1976 as part of the Qube development group, has been Director of Research for "The Electric Company," at Children's Television Workshop. She is responsible for having created "Pinwheel," a channel for preschool children from which she later developed Nickelodeon, a satellite-delivered, non-commercial and non-violent children's and young people's channel, now distributed by Warner Amex Satellite Entertainment

Company. In 1978, Dr. Horner became Corporate Vice President for Program Development for all Warner Amex cable systems. She holds B.A. and M.A. degrees in English from Ohio State University, and an M.S. degree in Linguistics and a Ph.D. in Psycholinguistics from the University of Rochester. She is presently President-Elect of Women in Cable and is Chairperson of the Cable Services Committee of the National Cable Television Association.

LARRY W. HOWE, Vice President-Corporate Development of American Television and Communications Corporation, is responsible for ATC new business in teletext, interactive services, advertising, merchandising, and other possible uses of cable broadband facilities. Joining ATC in 1976 as Director-New Venture Analysis, he became Vice President-Cable Programming in 1979. This position included supervision of program supplier negotiations; assistance to systems and franchise staff in design of program services; and planning for local origination and community access programming, including the design and staffing of studio.

Starting as a trainee for NBC News in 1968, he became producer for "The Advocates," a national PBS public affairs series; then Executive Producer of News and Public Affairs of KCET-TV, the public television station in Los Angeles.

Mr. Howe holds an MBA from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, a Masters in Communications from Stanford University, and an undergraduate degree from Yale. He serves on the National Cable Television Association's Cable Services Committee, the Executive Committee of the National Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network (C-SPAN), and the Cable Television Advertising Bureau Board of Governors.

CHARLOTTE SCHIFF JONES, Vice President for Marketing, CBS Cable: previously at Time, Inc., where she was Executive Vice President and Director, then at Manhattan Cable, and later Assistant Publisher, People Magazine. Before joining Time, Inc., she was Director, Community Programming, for Teleprompter, Inc. While at Time, Inc., Ms. Jones produced the PEOPLE television series shown on CBS in 1978 and was also Executive Producer of the Emmy-award-winning "New York Live" on Manhattan Cable. In 1976 Ms. Jones was cited by Business Week as one of the "Top 100 Corporate Women in America." She is active in civic affairs and was appointed by Governor Carey to represent business and industry on the New York State Employment Resources Council. She is a graduate of Columbia University, where she earned an M.A. in Business.

DAVID JONES is well known as a producer and director in theatre and television. In 1964 he was invited by Sir Peter Hall to join Britain's Royal Shakespeare Company as Artistic Controller. In 1966, Mr. Jones became an Associate Director of the RSC and Artistic Director of RSC's Aldwych Theatre in 1975. During his time with the RSC, his productions at Stratford-upon-Avon included Shakespeare's As You Like It, Love's Labour Lost, and Cymbeline. In London he was responsible for the English premiere of plays by such contemporary writers as John Arden, Gunter Grass, Graham Greene, David Mercer, and Peter Weiss. Other major dramatists whose work he has directed include Brecht, Chekhov, Gorky, Granville-Barker and O'Casey. Mr. Jones' work has been seen by audiences in Los Angles, at the Statford Festival in Ontario, and in Brooklyn, where his RSC production of Summerfolk won an Obie in 1975. Mr. Jones began his career in BBC-TV, making many documentary films for Monitor, before joining the RSC. He returned to television in 1977 for eighteen months as producer of Play of the Month, where his series included plays by Chekhov, Sartre, Buechner, Farquhar, Shaw, Edward Bond and Granville-Barker. His recent television films have included Chekhov's An Artist's Story, and Harold Pinter's adaptation of the Aiden Higgins novel Languish, Go Down. As Artistic Director of the BAM Theatre Company, he has directed Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale and A Midsummer Night's Dream, the American premiere of Gorky's Barbarians, and most recently, Brecht's Jungle of Cities. Mr. Jones is planning to direct Merry Wives and Pericles for BBC-TV's Shakespeare series in the fall of 1982.

MAURICE LEVINE is the Artistic Director of the 92nd Street Y's Lyrics and Lyricists series which has just completed its eleventh consecutive year, playing to sell-out audiences. He was co-executive producer with Sonny Fox for Columbia Pictures TV's They Write the Songs (Kander and Ebb, Yip Harburg, and Mitchell Parish) and co-executive producer with Richard Seader for Columbia Pictures TV's Oh Coward.

In the future, he will be co-executive producer with Messrs. Fox and Seader for CBS Cable's forthcoming series, The Song Writers (Sheldon Harnick, Charles Strouse, Burton Lane, Arthur Schwartz, Jerry Herman), and CBS Cable's Jack Gilford Plays Jack Gilford.

Levine holds a Bachelor of Music and Masters of Music degrees from Yale University. Kurt Weill chose him as conductor for his Broadway show, Lost in the Stars. He has conducted many original-cast Broadway show albums as well as Lotte Lenya's album, September Song, and Eartha Kitt's albums, Eartha Revisited and That Bad Eartha. He has guest conducted such major symphonies as the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia Orchestra, the Cleveland Orchestra, and the Hollywood Bowl Orchestra.

LEWIS L. LLOYD has been a consultant for programming to RCTV since last fall. He will continue his work as an independent television producer following the completion for RCTV, and the startup of the new Entertainment Channel, RCTV's new programming service.

He is Executive Producer of The Stravinsky Series, for PBS, three one-hour programs of music theatre pieces especially commissioned for television, to be released through WGBH-Boston. He was in charge of finance, administration, distribution, and planning for WGBH for five years, and before that was Program Director in charge of the Performing Arts for the New York State Council of the Arts. He was General Manager of the Brooklyn Academy of Music and for twelve years owned and operated The Pocket Theater, off-Broadway. He has served on advisory panels for the National Endowment for the Arts and the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities.

MARC LUSTGARTEN, President of Bravo, is an attorney with many years experience in program acquisition and development for cable television. In addition to being Chief Counsel for Cablevision Development Systems, he was responsible for the development of Sportschannel, a regionally distributed pay television sports service. Before working in cable TV, he served as counsel in the office of Mayor John Lindsay and as a member of various law firms. He has also worked as an accountant and teacher in the New York City school system. Mr. Lustgarten was graduated from Pace University and New York University Law School.

FERN McBRIDE is the Director of Program Development Eastcoast for Showtime. She covers everything from theatre to comedy to series to variety specials.

Prior to Showtime, she was an independent producer and writer. Her TV credits include being the Producer and Acting Executive Producer for WCBS-TV's Eye-On, a weekly documentary that won her her second Emmy award in 1979. In 1971, Ms. McBride won her first Emmy for outstanding local series with "Free Time," a live public affairs and entertainment show. She also has to her credits a half-hour pilot,"Artists Among Us," that deals with folk artists, and was senior producer and reporter for "The 51st State" for Public TV.

JIM MERVIS, Vice President, Programming, CBS Video Enterprises, is responsible for the programming activities of CVE, directing the Division's acquisitions of existing properties in the theatrical and non-theatrical areas and developing new programs designed specifically for the home video market.

Since 1980, Mr. Mervis has been with Showtime Entertainment, first as Director, Program Development, East Coast, and subsequently as Vice President of that department. From 1979-1980 he was Director, Business Affairs, East Coast, Viacom Enterprises. From 1973-1979 Mr. Mervis was an attorney with the firm Rubin Baum Levin Constant & Friedman. Mr. Mervis holds a B.S. degree from Cornell University School of Industry and Labor Relations and a J.D. degree from Fordham University School of Law.

FABRIZIO MILANO, Stage Director, has been associated with the Metropolitan Opera since 1970. During that time he has directed new productions of Il Trittico and La Boheme (telecast on "Live from the Met"), a new staging of Peleas et Melisande, and revivals of such operas as Otello and Cavaleria Rusticana/I Pagliacci, both of which were televised.

His career has taken him to practically every opera company in the United States -- this past season, for instance, he directed Maria Stuarda at New York City Opera, Falstaff for the Opera Company of Philadelphia, and Ariadne auf Naxos for the Los Angeles Opera Repertory Theatre. Next season, he opens the Metropolitan Opera with a new staging of Norma, returns to Chicago for Romeo et Juliet, and goes to San Diego for Turandot.

LOU MOORE is the founder and President of ELM Video Theatre, Inc., a company which serves as a representative of professional theatres around the country to all markets of the television industry, including cable, network and video. Prior to forming ELM Video Theatre, Ms. Moore was, for two years, the Director of Management Services at Theatre Communications Group (TCG) where she was responsible for the first major National Computer Conference for the Arts, which involved theatres, dance and opera companies, and symphony orchestras. At TCG she also provided services in fiscal management, board development, and long-range planning, as well as having organized workshops across the country in marketing and fund-raising. Ms. Moore served as the Managing Director of the Dallas Shakespeare Festival for five years after receiving her M.F.A. in Arts Administration from Southern Methodist University.

STUART B. REKANT has been Vice President of Business Affairs at HBO since 1980. He came to that position from two years as Director of Business Affairs for Film Programming from 1978 to 1980. In 1975 and 1976 he was a member of the Legal Department at Columbia Pictures, and from 1976 to 1978, he was an associate at Harold Orenstein, P.C., the entertainment law firm. He holds an A.B. from Colgate University, and a J.D. degree from the Boston University School of Law.

M. EDGAR ROSENBLUM, Executive Director of Long Wharf Theatre for the past ten years, has overseen the growth of the theatre to a position of international prominence. In addition to managing the production business of the theatre, he is involved in every aspect of the theatre's operations. Mr. Rosenblum is Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Corporate Theater Fund, an organization created to increase and strengthen the corporate support of the non-profit professional theatre in the United States. He also serves on the National Arts Policy Committee of the American Arts Alliance, as well as on the Board of the Connecticut Advocates for the Arts. He has worked as a consultant for the Foundation for the Extension and Development of the American Professional Theatre, the New York State Council on the Arts, the Massachusetts Arts Council, and the Rhode Island Commission on the Arts. He is a former officer of the League of Resident Theatres. Mr. Rosenblum has devised ways to entend the life of Long Wharf productions, and expand the audience they reach by transferring them to the New York stage, other theatres throughout the country, or to television. In recent years those transfers have included the Broadway engagement of The Shadow Box, which won the Pulitzer Prize and the Tony Award for the Best Play of 1977, The Gin Game, which won the Pulitzer Prize of 1978, the South African drama Sizwe Banzi is Dead, David Storey's The Changing Room, Peter Nichol's Forget-Me-Not Lane and The National Health, and David Rabe's Streamers, which was named Best Play of the Season by the prestigious Drama Critics Circle. In addition, five productions have been transferred to the Public Broadcasting System, including D.H. Lawrence's The Widowing of Mrs. Holroyd, Peter Nichol's Forget-Me-Not Lane, and Eugene O'Neill's Ah, Wilderness!

ROBERT H. RUBIN is Vice President of Programming for Group W Cable Productions, a division of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Company. Group W Cable Productions is a major supplier of theatrical programs to the new technologies.

Prior to joining Group W, he served as Executive Producer of Interactive Programming at QUBE and Director of Program Development of Warner Cable. Bob has been an independent packager, has produced shows for all three networks, has been nominated for three Emmy awards, and was for many years the producer of the successful NBC show, "Jeopardy."

BILL SIEGLER has a long list of shows to his production credit. Starting as a unit manager with NBC, he acted as associate producer with Joseph Gates Company for nineteen pilots, pageants, series and shows from 1972 to 1978, and was Vice Presdient for Production at Reeves Teletape Corporation.

Since then, in addition to acting as a production consultant to Showtime, he has produced Jules Feiffer's "Hold Me!", "Eubie," "The Peking Opera," "Little Johnny Jones," and "Monteith & Rand," for Showtime; "David Brenner Returns," "Redd Foxx," "Rock 'N' Roll Reunion," "Tom Jones & Tina Turner,"

"All Star Country Music Festival," and "King Goes to Queens -- Alan King Special," "The Donna Fargo Show," for Osmond Television; "A Party with Betty Comden & Adolph Green," and "The Madwoman of Central Park West," for Mobil Showcase; and "The New York Area Emmy Show" for WOR-TV.

SUZANNE WEIL is the Director of the PTV-1 program service of the Public Broadcasting Service. Now overseeing programming for public television's national "prime time" schedule, she has also served as Director of Arts and Humanitites Programming. She has had considerable leadership experience in the performing arts, as Director of the Dance Program for the National Endowment for the Arts and, before that, as Coordinator of Performing Arts, Walker Arts Center, Minneapolis. Ms. Weil has served on numerous advisory boards including the NEA's Dance Advisory Panel, Public Media Program Panel and Artsits-in the Schools Jazz and Dance Panels and presently is on the International Board of INPUT (International Public Television Screening Conference), the Board of Directors of the Twyla Tharp Dance Foundation and the National Arts Advisory Board of Action for Children's Teleivision. Ms. Weil attended the University of Minnesota and the Institute for Arts Administration, Harvard University.

ARTHUR WHITELAW, forty-one years old, has produced or co-produced Best Foot Forward (Liza Minelli's first stage appearance), Cabin in the Sky; Ken Murray's Hollywood; Hildegard in London (which he also directed); You're a Good Man, Charlie Brown (including thirteen national and seven international companies); The Gingerbread Lady (national company starring Nancy Kelly); Children, Children starring Gwen Verdon; Minnie's Boys starring Shelley Winters; 70, Girls, 70 starring Mildred Natwick; Thoughts; Some of My Best Friends starring Ted Knight; P.S. Your Cat is Dead starring Sal Mineo and Keir Dullea; Snoopy (which he also directed and co-authored); and, The Utter Glory of Morrisey Hall starring Celeste Holme. Mr. Whitelaw has directed over twenty plays in New York, on the road and in London including road companies of Butterflies Are Free starring Gloria Swanson and Joan Bennett; Charlie Brown; A Woman and Her Blues starring Juanita Hall (her last stage appearance); The Gershwin Years starring Ethel Merman, Ginger Rogers, Benny Goodman, Bobby Short and Richard Kiley. He has produced for Hallmark Hall of Fame (NBC-TV) and was Vice President in charge of Production for Apjac (the Arthur Jacobs Company) that produced all the Planet of the Apes movies, Tom Sawyer, etc.

STAN WOJEWODSKI, JR. is now in his fourth season as Artistic Director at Center Stage. His work for the theatre includes, among other, Sally's Gone, She Left Her Name, Agnes of God, Cyrano de Bergerac, Bonjou, La, Bonjour, Measure for Measure, Ashes, and Old Times.

Mr. Wojewodski devised (with Michael Styer) Center Stage's joint video production with the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, directing with Tom Barnett, and an adaptation of Melville's Bartleby the Scrivener (named Best Dramatic Program of the Year by the Corporation of Public Broadcasting).

In 1979 he inaugurated the Center Stage First Stage series, designed to provide workshops for new scripts as well as for testing new approaches to proven texts and the discover (or re-discovery) of performance styles appropriate to them. He has directed for the Americna Stage Festival and the Manhattan Theatre Club, and The Rainmaker for the 1980 Berkshire Theatre Festival.

An M.F.A. graduate of the Catholic University of America, he has lectured at the Foundation for the Extension and Development of the American Professional Theatre's management series at the O'Neill Center and at Boston and Southern Methodist Universities under the auspices of the League of Professional Theatre Training Programs. A member of the Board of Overseers of the Baltimore School of the Arts, Mr. Wojewodski served as the national adjudicator for the 1980 American College Theatre Festival at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. He is currently preparing the inaugural production of the Santa Fe Theatre Festival.

Appendix III: Conferees

A CLEAR SPACE
Ruth Davis, Media Director
45 5th Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003

ACUCAA
Gayle Crum, Editor
P.O. Box 2137
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

AKRON SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA
Susan Hansen, Special Project Coordinator
E.J. Thomas Hall
Center & Hill Streets
Akron, Ohio 44325

ALASKA REPERTORY THEATRE
Mark Somers
Barbara Spear
705 West 6th Street, Suite 201
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

ALLEY THEATRE
Bill Halbert, Business Manager
Bob Feingold, Publicity Director
15 Texas Avenue
Houston, Texas 77002

ALVIN AILEY AMERICAN DANCE THEATRE
Edna Moore
1515 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

AMERICAN ARTS ALLIANCE
Anne Murphy, Executive Director
424 C Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

AMERICAN PLACE THEATRE
Martha Fischer
111 West 46th Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA
Arthur Aaron
119 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LEAGUE
Kathy French
P.O. Box 669
Vienna, Virginia 22180

ARENA STAGE
Zelda Fichandler, Producing Director
Thomas Fichandler, Executive Director
Sixth Street & Maine Avenue SW
Washington, D.C. 20024

ARTPARK
Courtney Callender
Box 371
Lewiston, N.Y. 14092

AT&T
Martis J. Davis
195 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10007

BALTIMORE MUSEUM OF ART
John Lamb
1734 Bolton Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21217

BECKER-FLAXMAN & ASSOCIATES
John Flaxman
1270 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10020

BONFILS THEATRE
Henry Lowenstein, Producer
Dr. William Gould
Brockman Seawell
East Colfax at Elizabeth
Denver, Colorado 80206

Bregman, Elizabeth
641 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

Bruell, Lucy
19 West 70th Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

CBS INC.
John W. Kiermier
50 West 52nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

CENTER STAGE
Sally Livingston
700 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

CHANNEL 11
Ellen Goosenberg
11 WPIX Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017

CHANNEL 13
Patsy Gesell
256 West 58th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

CHAUTAUQUA INSTITUTION
Phil Zimmer, Director of Communications
Chautauqua, N.Y. 14722

Ciampa, John
50 Morningside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10028

CINCINNATI PLAYHOUSE IN THE PARK
Michael Murray, Producing Director
Box 6537
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

CIRCLE REPERTORY
Paul Daniels, Business Manager
161 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10013

CLEVELAND OPERA
David Bamberger, General Manager &
Artistic Director
Gayle Waxman, Director of Public
Relations
1438 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

COLONNADES THEATRE LAB
Mary T. Nealon, Managing Director
428 Lafayette Street
New York, N.Y. 10003

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
Susan Leaming
14 West 87th Street
New York, N.Y. 10024
Donald Moore
560 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027
Peter Herdrich
949 West End Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10025

COMMUNITY TV REVIEW
University Community Video
Pat Brenna
425 Ontario SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

CONNECTICUT PUBLIC TV
Nancy Savin, Producer/Host
24 Summit Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

DANCE MAGAZINE
John Gruen
317 West 83rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10024

D/H PRODUCTIONS
William Donnell
Richard Humphrey
250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

DRETZIN & KNAUFF, P.C.
Harry Weintraub
123 East 62nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

DRUM CORPS WORLD
Alex Saloutos
254 West Gilmans Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

EGLEVSKY BALLET
Lance Olson, Business Manager
999 Herricks Road
New Hyde Park, N.Y. 11040

ELM VIDEO ENTERPRISES
Charles Kopelman
240 West 44th Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

ENCOMPASS THEATRE
Roger Cunningham
P.O. Box 229
New York, N.Y. 10036

ENSEMBLE STUDIO THEATRE
Curt Dempster
549 West 52nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

FDM Productions
Francoise deMenil
Gayle Blackston
745 5th Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10151

THE FELD BALLET
Cora Cahan, Executive Director
Elizabeth Cashour, Director of Development
Cathy Cameron, Comptroller
890 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10003

Fishko, Robert
1501 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

GARLIN/ALPERT PRODUCTIONS
Gary Mullin
114 East 1st Street #13
New York, N.Y. 10009

GEVA THEATRE
Gideon Schein, Artistic Director
Bruce Rodgers, Literary Director
168 South Clinton Avenue
Rochester, N.Y. 14604

GOODSPEED OPERA HOUSE
Elizabeth Dickinson, Director of Special Projects
East Haddam, Connecticut 06423

Greene, Alexis
200 East 15th Street
New York, N.Y. 10003

HARBOR CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS
Grace Jaffe, Arts Program Coordinator
1 East 104th Street
New York, N.Y. 10029

HARTFORD STAGE COMPANY
Bill Stewart, Managing Director
Bill Monroe, General Manager
50 Church Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

HARTMAN THEATRE COMPANY
Donna Gillroy
Mike Valerio
Box 521
Stamford, Connecticut 06904

HAWAII PUBLIC TELEVISION
Nino J. Martin, Executive Producer-Director
2350 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Henry, Anne
258 South Main Street
Sherborne, Massachusetts 01770

HENRY STREET SETTLEMENT
Woodie King
466 Grand Street
New York, N.Y. 10002

HOME VIDEO REPORT
Knowledge Industries Publications, Inc.
Jeffrey Silverstein
701 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, N.Y. 10604

Hoover, Regina
38 West 9th Street
New York, N.Y. 10011

RICHARD HORNER ASSOCIATES
Richard Horner
65 West 55th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

INTERMEDIA
David Sector, Creative Director
189 2nd Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003

Janows, Jill
533 East 83rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10028

JOFFREY BALLET
Maureen Walsh
130 West 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

JUJAMCYN THEATRES
Aldo Scrofani, Secretary/Treasurer
246 West 44th Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

KANSAS CITY ARTS COUNCIL
Elizabeth Kennedy, Associate Director
20 West 9th Street, Suite 433A
Kansas City, Missouri 64105

Karp, Arthur
562 West End Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10024

EDWARD LEVIN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Edward Levin, President
140 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10024

LYRIC OPERA OF CHICAGO
Farrell Frentress
20 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

MANHATTAN THEATRE CLUB
Barry Grove, Executive Director
321 East 73rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

MANUFACTURERS HANOVER
Marcia Bresslour
270 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

MANUS & WEISS
Justin Manus
Leonard Gold
770 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

MARTHA GRAHAM DANCE COMPANY
James Grant, Company Manager
316 East 63rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

MCLAUGLIN-BESWICK DANCE THEATRE
Bob Beswick
Rt. 1
Norwood, N.Y. 13668

Montel, Michael
55 East 73rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

MUSIC FAIR ENTERPRISES
Sheldon Gross, President
Lee Guber, Vice President
176 Swedesford Road
Devon, Pennsylvania 19333

NATIONAL BLACK THEATRE
Devorah Gilbert
9 East 125th Street
New York, N.Y. 10025

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
Dance Program
Rhoda Grauer
2401 East Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20506

NEGRO ENSEMBLE COMPANY
Leon Denmark
Horacena Taylor
165 West 46th Street, Suite 1015
New York, N.Y. 10036

NEW DRAMATISTS
David Juaire, Program Director
424 West 44th Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

NEW YORK CITY OPERA
Roberta Edles, Director,
Media and Special Projects
New York State Theatre
Lincoln Center
New York, N.Y. 10023

NEW YORK SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL
Lynn Holst, Literary Manager
425 Lafayette Street
New York, N.Y. 10003

NEW YORK STATE HARLEM URBAN
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Gwendolyn Scott
163 West 125th Street
New York, N.Y. 10025

OOBA (Off-Off Broadway Alliance)
Nancy Heller
162 West 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

OPERA AMERICA
Martin Kagan
1010 Vermont NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

THE OPERA ORCHESTRA OF NEW YORK
Diane Hoar, General Manager
10 East 53rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10022

OPPORTUNITY RESOURCES FOR THE ARTS
Lindsay Gambini
1501 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

PACIFIC NORTHWEST BALLET
Margo Donaldson, General Manager
4649 Sunnyside Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98103

PENTACLE
Ivan Sygoda, Director
200 West 72nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

PERFORMING ARTS REPERTORY THEATRE FOUNDATION
Jay Harnick, Artistic Director
131 West 86th Street
New York, N.Y. 10024

Petscheck, Nancy

PHYLLIS LAMBERT DANCE COMPANY
Judith Liegner
1860 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10023

PLAYWRIGHTS HORIZONS
Janet Stott
416 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

QUAIGH THEATRE
Dey Gosse
108 West 43rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

RENWOOD PRODUCTIONS, INC.
Samuel Woodward
P.O. Box 4122
Midland, Texas 79704

THE RIVERSIDE CHURCH
Andrew Sarfaty
490 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

SAN FRANCISCO BALLET
Tim Duncan, General Manager
378 - 18th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94121

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NETWORK
Charles S. Morris, Director, Div. of Programming Operations
Thomas L. Stepp, Deputy Manager
Drawer L
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

SSDC (Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers)
Shepard Traube
Jim Furlong
1501 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

STAGE ONE PRODUCTIONS
Kaleel Sakakeeny, Artistic Director
21 Bennett Street
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

GAIL STAYDEN PRODUCTIONS
Janus Films
Gail Stayden
216 South Rexford Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90212

Swartz, Herbert
26 Bradbury Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

TAG FOUNDATION (Technical Assistants Group)
Sharon Rupert
45 5th Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003

TDF (Theatre Development Fund)
Barbara Hauptman, Director of Operations
Melinda Little, Research Associate
1501 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
School of Communications and Theatre
Paul Mareth, Assistant Professor of Communications
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

TEXAS OPERA THEATRE
Carol Yamamoto, Marketing Director
401 Louisiana, 8th floor
Houston, Texas 77002

TCG (Theatre Communications Group)
David Visser, Director of Management Services
355 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

THEATRE OF THE OPEN EYE
Stephen Tenney
316 East 88th Street
New York, N.Y. 10028

UNITED SCENIC ARTISTS
Domingo A. Rodriguez, Business Agent
1540 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10036

VIOLA FARBER DANCE COMPANY
Anne Camp, Company Manager
30 East 31st Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

VIRGINIA MUSEUM THEATRE
Baylor Landrum, Administrative Director
Boulevard & Grove Avenues
Richmond, Virginia 23221

VIVIAN BEAUMONT THEATRE - LINCOLN
CENTER THEATRE COMPANY/ANTA
Scott Steele
150 West 65th Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

VOLUNTEER LAWYERS FOR THE ARTS
Arlene Shuler, Executive Director
36 West 44th Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

WARNER THEATRE PRODUCTIONS
Claire Nichtern, President
666 5th Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

MICHAEL WASHBURN & ASSOCIATES
Pat Quinn
105 West 55th Street
New York, N.Y. 10019

WGBH-TV
Brigid Sullivan
Glenn Litton
125 Western Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02134

WNYC
Barbara Sirota, Manager of Program
Development
2500 Municipal Building
1 Centre Street
New York, N.Y. 10067

YALE DRAMA SCHOOL
Michael Fain
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Appendix IV: Annotated Bibliography

These books and publications are listed as good sources of information on the field of cable television for people who wish to learn more about the field.

The Cable Answer Book, to be published by the Cabletelevision Advertising Bureau, is designed to introduce cable television to potential advertisers. Expected to be printed and available by late November, it will be made available to non-members at a modest charge. Contact The Cabletelevision Bureau, 767 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Cablevision, the Weekly Premium Television Magazine. Available by subscription at $54 per year. Send request with check to Cablevision Circulation Department, Titsch Publishing, 2500 Curtis Street, Denver, Colorado 80205. Phone: (303) 573-1433.

Channels of Communications is a new bi-monthly magazine whose aim is, in the words of Les Brown, its Editor-in-Chief, "to sort out and interpret the developments in the booming business of telecommunications with a view to the public's stake in them." For information, write Channels, 1515 Broadway, New York, New York 10036. Phone: (212) 398-1300. The charter subscription rate is $15 per year. Send check to P.O. Box 2100, Mahopac, New York 10541.

Multichannel News, a weekly newspaper covering "the new electronic media," is a solid, accessible source of information on the industry. The publication style and language make it accessible to the lay person. Available only by subscription. $18.50 per year. For information and rates, write to Circulation, Multichannel News, 1762 Emerson Drive, Denver, Colorado 80218. Phone: (303) 832-4141.

Keeping Pace with the New Television: Public Television and Changing Technology, Sheila Mahoney, Nick DeMartino, Robert Stengel; the Carnegie Corporation, 1980, gives a thorough introduction to and examination of the new technology and introduces a proposal for a nonprofit cable network for the performing arts, culture and entertainment. A very good source of definitions and explanations of basic terms and operations. Available only from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. $3.25 check MUST accompany order or order will not be filled. Phone: (202) 785-1100.

Theatre Crafts, October 1981 issue is devoted to a survey of cable television and the performing arts. Single copies are available at $3.00 per copy from Theatre Crafts, 250 West 57th Street, Suite 312, New York, New York, 10107.